THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Mr. Arnold S. Nash holds graduate degrees in chemistry, philosophy, and sociology. So on the face of it he is well qualified to write 'An Essay in the Social Philosophy of University Education'—*The University and the Modern World*.[1] And the Essay he has written is one that well deserves to be read. There might be profounder treatments of the subject, but the Essay obviously seeks to be comprehensive rather than profound, and here to be comprehensive is a great merit.

In a foreword Reinhold Niebuhr writes: 'Mr. Nash has opened a most interesting discussion in this book. It is his thesis that the modern University has built its curriculum and elaborated its educational procedures upon the basis of an inadequate philosophy. It has assumed that the scientific method and spirit are an adequate guide in the pursuit of knowledge. The difficulty with this assumption is that science as such can have no sense of the meaning of life or of history.'

We are not here concerned with Part One, which shows the plight of the liberal democratic University; for the liberal *Weltanschauung*, based upon the premise that science deals with facts and not with values, is dissolving before our eyes. Nor are we here concerned with Part Two, which rejects the totalitarian synthesis of knowledge, whether it be Marxist or Fascist, as merely aggravating the conditions that produced the disease of modern civilization. The great task of the University remains, which is to place each item of fact in the realm of meaning.

It is Part Three with which we are here concerned, in which Mr. Nash seeks to support the cause of reconstruction in University education. In this cause, as he holds, a fresh source of wisdom is needed. 'And from where can that wisdom come unless it be from a re-interpretation of the Judaic-Christian tradition which, having outlasted the fall of many civilizations, has therefore a source beyond any one of them?'

It is a task of supreme moment that confronts the University teacher who stands in the Judaic-Christian tradition. It is to help create a *Weltanschauung* which steers a middle path between the Charybdis of liberal atomism (in which each academic subject is autonomous) and the Scylla of totalitarian dogmatism (in which facts have to be twisted into a framework). The professional theologian rarely views his task so comprehensively as it should be viewed if he is to work out the new Christian 'map of knowledge' that our age requires. Accordingly, it is for the Christian thinkers from the specialized fields of science (natural and social), history, engineering, architecture, and medicine to unite with the theologians in the common task of a theological understanding of human nature and destiny.

Religion should not be one subject among others of University education. It should not be placed on the same basis as other subjects of the curriculum. Differences in religious belief are not on the same plane as differences in physics or chemistry. Religion is not so much one subject among others as that which gives meaning to the whole. It is 'not a compartmentalized experience,' says a Professor of Religious Education in Chicago, 'but a quality that potentially inheres in any and every experience.'

Dr. William Temple's words are worth recalling here: 'We have supposed that it is possible to provide education which is religiously neutral, to which religion can then be added in greater or less measure. But, in fact, an education which is not religious, is atheistic; there is no middle way. If you give to children an account of the world from which God is left out, you are teaching them to understand the world without reference to God.

[1] S.C.M.; 12s. 6d. net.

If He is then introduced, He is an excrescence. He becomes an appendix to His own creation.'

It takes Mr. NASH'S argument a stage further to notice that, according to a leading English educator, 'the ultimate basis of all sound education is not Enquiry but Faith.' Of course it may be faith in the liberal-rationalist version of human nature and destiny or faith in the Biblical version. In the one case the emphasis laid upon man's sinfulness in traditional theology is rejected from educational theory, in the other case it is endorsed. Mr. NASH subscribes to the second version, and concludes that Christian scholars must work out a conception of education which gives meaning to the whole of knowledge, but which does not confuse the spirit of the age (liberal-rationalist) with the spirit of the ages.

As already hinted, Mr. NASH is not content with the usual attitude of the professional or academic theologian towards the attempt to introduce Christian presuppositions into the study of, say, literature, history, and the social sciences, or to relate the conclusions of the specialized subjects of the University curriculum to a theological understanding of man's nature and destiny. This applies alike to Great Britain and the United States. 'We fail to find any recognition of the need for the Christian equivalent to the intellectual synthesis of biology, economics, psychology, philosophy, and the like, which the Marxists or the Nazis readily furnish, in terms of their distinctive and calamitous presuppositions, for any student who asks for it.'

It may be regarded as the burden of this book that theology should be restored to its rightful position as queen of the sciences in the original meaning of the term 'science.' Not that theology can dictate conclusions throughout the whole realm of scholarship and learning. But there will always be need for the study of the records of Divine revelation to Israel and in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. The article this month in 'The New Order' series deals with this important subject of the place of Theology in a University.

Dr. Ernest F. SCOTT is doyen of the scholars of a classic period of liberal theology. It is regrettable that his latest book, *The Varieties of New Testament Religion*,[1] has not arrived except in odd copies on this side of the Atlantic. For there has seldom appeared a study at once so wide in range and so profoundly learned, and yet so short and clear and unencumbered: so radical and free, and at the same time so central and sympathetic and upbuilding. It will be a sad day if the epithet liberal is ever generally taken in the scornful sense some try to-day to attach to it. 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.' To have the Spirit is to believe in liberty, in the liberated outlook, in the liberal attitude to all truth. The alternative means trying to fight the good fight *for* faith from some supposed bomb-proof funkhole covered by chunks of the broken masonry of ancient dogma. 'Unless religion can hold its own with the best culture of its time,' says Dr. SCOTT, 'it degenerates sooner or later into a superstition.'

[1] Scribners, New York; $2.75.

Many books have been written about the unanimity of the New Testament witness to Christ. Their plan is to compare the various testimonies, either generally or from some particular angle. The differences are noted and examined with all the critical scholarship and acumen the author may possess. Then it is noted that these differences are not irreconcilable. They combine to deepen the one impression made by Jesus Christ, and to establish the doctrine which is enshrined in the confessions of the Church. The New Testament is thus essentially a unity, a homogeneous body of evidence for the Christian faith. A competent modern theology can frankly admit the distinctive characteristics of its component parts and yet arrive at a broad synthesis. And the attractive suggestion, in which there is so much truth, is worked in, that the simple Christian who just accepts the unity of his New Testament and enriches his mind with all its contents will get as near to Christ as any critic.

Dr. SCOTT makes a very different approach. He hails not the unity but the diversity of the New Testament witness to Jesus. Any synthesis of its doctrine would have the unreality of a composite photograph. The witness of each writer is given in his own terms, using his own ways of thought, complete in itself and neither designed nor suited to be dovetailed into one structure with the witness of others. The real authoritativeness of the New Testament is not its unity but its diversity. Its direction is not that all its interpretations of Christ are to be fitted into one scheme but that it remains open for anyone to offer his own fresh interpretation. The New Testament is the Magna Charta of liberty, not a touchstone of orthodoxy. Orthodoxy is indeed not a New Testament conception. Unity in the Church grew not from doctrine but from persecution. The key-word, 'Jesus is Lord,' was not a creed but an oath, binding not to thought but to action. From the earliest days, and still it is the

Christian way of life, the Christian ethic that has been the constant factor in the Christian religion.

This beginning makes the reader impatient to find what Dr. Scott has to say about Reunion. The very title of this book is indeed an assertion that as there are varieties of Christianity already to be seen in the New Testament there is presumably room for more. Why is unity becoming more and more the conscious aim of the Church? 'To multitudes of Christians it appears more important that they should be agreed than that they should assert their right to freedom.' It will therefore be refreshing to many ears weary of the reiteration by all the sects of the truism that the Church is essentially one, and its supposed corollary that Christians should be ashamed of their divisions, to listen to Dr. Scott's cheerful acceptance of variety. 'Division is involved in the very nature of our religion. . . . For the aim of the Church is to make personalities. . . . It is true that the Church unites men but it also keeps them divided, and this is its more important function. Its task is to bring men into such fellowship with God that they will look solely to His authority.' In the New Testament age differences were tolerated without bitterness, just as to-day rival theories in mathematical physics are regarded as equally tentative yet worthy of respect. James' concordat with Paul was no compromise but the recognition that all parties should be true to their own convictions, and that the gospel was more than any one mode of interpreting it. The cause of divergences is not sin but the natural differences characterizing men who are confronted with the call to make what they can of the many-sided richness and complexity of the mind of Jesus Christ. The finality of Christianity is that it is thus capable of endless growth and renewal.

The most brilliant chapter is perhaps that on Hebrews, an epistle having at first glance, because of its pre-occupation with Jewish ritual, an alien look. Dr. Scott notes in it features peculiarly Western and even modern. Its acquaintance with Judaism is through its literature and ritual rather than through experience like Paul's of its legalism. The meaning it gives to faith is not Paul's meaning of self-surrender, or anything like mysticism, but the present-day idealistic sense of an instinct or hope or intuition. And in other directions it is curiously up to date: in its interest in comparative religion; in its stress on action in finding the ultimate test of validity in intrinsic worth; and in its constant interest in the historic Jesus.

The treatment of the Fourth Gospel is both lucid and profound. He finds it twofold history; on one plane history of the earthly life, with a primitive document of value behind it, giving the same general outline of events as the Synoptics, and the same picture of Jesus—weary, weeping, washing the disciples' feet; on the other plane a history of the way the eternal life revealed itself. Primitive ideas about Messiah, Resurrection, the Second Coming remain embedded in this Gospel but unnoticed by its author. Nor is he aware that his logos doctrine tends to make religion metaphysical and to displace ethics by the idea of new or eternal life. About the facts and experiences which were his starting-point his mind kept thinking along the lines on which it could move. 'As a Hellenist he found apocalyptic ideas uncongenial and tried instead to state the Christian message in such a way that he could honestly believe it. Nothing was further from his intention than to lay down doctrines henceforth to be accepted as final. He was the vehicle by which the Spirit conveyed the truth in his own particular time. His task was to discover what Christ meant for men now, and so to utter his thought with perfect sincerity. He would not have worried had he known that his formulation would grow out of date. He would have said, "The Spirit leads to all truth, and in every age it leads by a new road."'

There is no space to touch on Dr. Scott's most critical and yet reverential estimate of Paul. Here, however, are a few of the illuminating suggestions that lie scattered through his pages. He says the primitive mode of Christian thinking was not reflection but vision, and that the great needs of the first age were the same as ours—deliverance and guidance. He sees in docetism not just philosophic foolishness but a way of standing reverently back from Christ at a date when Jesus was almost awkwardly familiar to living memory. He thinks that the Jewish Christian opposition to Paul might have meant to argue, along lines that furnish relevant criticism of modern missionary methods too, that Paul's plan was too individualistic, and that the true strategy was first to produce one genuinely Christian nation to be a solid spearhead of the advance.

The New Order.

XII. The Place of Theology in a University.

By Professor J. M. Shaw, D.D., Queen's Theological College, Kingston, Ontario.

The purpose of this article is to suggest and support the position that Theology has a proper place in a University curriculum, and that this proper place is a central one, the centre of reality being spiritual.

I.

I shall begin by recalling the statement of John Henry Newman on this matter made many years ago—in 1852 to be exact—in a famous Essay included in his volume of Essays entitled *The Idea of a University*, to this effect:

'A University, I should lay down, by its very name professes to teach universal knowledge: Theology is surely a branch of knowledge; how then is it possible for it to profess all branches of knowledge, and yet to exclude from the subjects of its teaching one which, to say the least, is as important and as large as any of them?' 'University teaching without Theology,' he adds, 'is simply unphilosophical.' (See *A Newman Treasury*, Selections from the Prose Works of John Henry Cardinal Newman, ed. C. F. Harrold [Longmans, 1943], 43, 58.)

This is a statement indeed much less bold and provocative than the one I have ventured to advance, and yet it will serve as at least a beginning, a first step, in my argument. If a University professes to teach universal knowledge, as its ancient designation of a *Studium Generale* or *Universale*, a school of general or universal learning, implies, then a University curriculum which does not include religious knowledge, that religious knowledge which we call Theology, answers in a very incomplete and inadequate way to the name of a University.

This department of knowledge which is called Theology has indeed, it must be acknowledged, often been presented in a way which has done little to commend it to inclusion in a proper University curriculum. So it has been, as often as it has been presented as a dry-as-dust record and investigation of arid doctrinal controversies of long ago which seem to have little or no relevance to present everyday life and interest. This latter tended to be the subject largely of what has been traditionally called 'Dogmatic Theology'—that department of Theology which is concerned with the interpretation and systematic presentation of the 'dogmas' or authoritative doctrines of the Christian Church. But this is a narrower and more limited use of the term 'Theology' than we are here considering. Theology, as we are here using the term, means literally and fundamentally the science of God and of things spiritual, just as Geology means literally the science of the constitution and structure of the earth, or Biology the science of life and living organisms, or Psychology the science of mind and mental process. And as such, as the science of God and of things spiritual, or as we should perhaps rather say as the science of religion and religious truth, it claims to supply us with a knowledge of a department of thought and life which is fundamental and central to reality or experience in all its aspects.

II.

Now this is a claim which may be disputed and has often been disputed on different grounds, chiefly probably on this ground—and we shall consider this objection first—that the department of knowledge with which Theology deals is not properly called knowledge, and on this account should not be included in a University curriculum. This is an objection which is raised in the name of science by those scientists who claim that knowledge proper, knowledge which is objectively true, true objective scientific knowledge, is confined to what is called the natural sciences, the sciences which deal with nature in its various aspects. So it is an objection this which is very commonly made in days such as the present when the scientific interest, the natural science interest, is the dominant interest in University thought and learning, and when through the dominance in education of the physical sciences the tendency is to suggest that only what can be measured or weighed is really knowable or scientifically apprehensible. It was different in earlier days, in the Middle Ages, *e.g.*, when a more properly philosophical interest was given the central place in University studies. I say 'a more properly philosophical interest' as distinguished from the present time when, as in so many instances, the dominating interest even in philosophy has become the science of Psychology, and in particular the 'New Psychology' with its tendency to represent the belief in God and the spiritual world generally as a delusion or illusion, the product of mere

'wishful thinking,' the projecting of man's own wishes or desires into the world of outer objective or trans-subjective reality, the 'mere projection' or self-painting of our own purely subjective wishes and desires with nothing in the world of outer trans-subjective reality to correspond to it.

This is an objection which is the result or product, however, not of a properly scientific spirit or attitude but of a scientific dogmatism—if indeed this is not a contradiction in terms—I mean a dogmatism on the part of so-called scientists, the dogmatism which assumes that scientific knowledge, true objective scientific knowledge, is confined to the realm of what is ordinarily called natural scientific knowledge, knowledge obtainable or attainable by the methods proper to the realm of what we call 'the natural sciences.' This in effect was the objection which the poet Tennyson, under the influence of the mid-Victorian scientific way of thinking of his time, a way of thinking which on the acknowledgment of scientists themselves is to-day largely obsolete though it has some unfortunate survivals, gave expression to in these terms :

> We have but faith : we cannot know ;
> For knowledge is of things we see.

In matters of religion and religious truth, he meant, we can only have 'faith,' not knowledge proper—that faith which William James defined as 'believing what you know is not true.' This, however, is an unwarranted, a philosophically unwarranted and unjustifiable, limitation of the term knowledge, which would thus confine or restrict it to the knowledge of nature and the world about us, the knowledge in Tennyson's words of 'things we see' or can measure. These so-called material forces of which the natural scientist, the physicist, *e.g.*, or the chemist, speaks so much, what are they ? The more they are being investigated to-day by what is called the 'New Physics,' the more they are being resolved into something spiritual. In the hands of the new physicist solid matter and the solid atoms of which matter was supposed to be composed have disappeared. The atom has been resolved into a bundle of energy, into bundles or packets or waves or undulations of energy of various sorts. So that we hear to-day not only of protons and electrons, but also of neutrons, positrons, mesotrons, and what not, without the new physicist on his own acknowledgment having any clear conception of what these names signify. As one of these scientists themselves, Sir Arthur Eddington, has frankly put it, 'Something unknown is doing we know not what.' So that he says, 'What is the use of talking about materialism when we do not know what matter or the material is ?' As Professor A. N. Whitehead of Harvard has put it to the same effect in his *Science and Progress*, 'What is the sense of talking about a mechanical explanation, when you do not know what you mean by mechanics ?' So that the result of the latest scientific investigations is the acknowledgment on the part of scientists or scientific philosophers themselves that so far from material forces being the only thing we know, and knowledge being only of 'things we see,' we really do not know what this matter which we see is, and the only kind of force or energy which we really know, know at first hand, is what we call spiritual energy, the energy namely of our own wills or persons. In the words of Sir Arthur Eddington, to quote him again, 'The stuff of the world is mind-stuff' or 'spirit-stuff' (*The Nature of the Physical World*, 276). And : 'Mind is the first and most direct thing in our experience ; all else is remote inference' (*Science and the Unseen World*, 35).

III.

The truth in the objection to religious knowledge, or knowledge of God and things spiritual, being admitted into the realm of valid objective scientific truth, and thus into the proper curriculum of a University, is that for the attainment of religious knowledge other conditions are required than for the attainment of knowledge with which the so-called objective natural sciences are concerned. But this is in the very nature of the case. As Aristotle already long ago pointed out, there are different levels of reality or of objects to be known, and each level of reality demands its own specific conditions for its proper knowledge. At all levels of reality the known subject or personality is active in the process of knowing. This is the great truth which Immanuel Kant emphasized in the history of modern philosophy. But according to the kind or level of object to be known, the knowing personality is active in different ways or degrees. In particular, there is the difference between the degree or kind of activity of the knowing personality involved in the knowledge of nature and the world about us, the knowledge of things, and that involved in properly personal knowledge, the knowledge of persons. In the rational scientific knowledge of nature and the world about us, that knowledge which comes to its perfection in the exact knowledge of the natural sciences, what is involved and demanded is a certain degree of the development of the intelligence or reason. Given a certain degree of the development of the rational understanding—that degree of development involved in the conception of causation or 'cause and effect'—and scientific knowledge of things becomes possible. But for the more concrete knowledge of persons, that knowledge of practical understanding

and appreciation which friends have of one another, other conditions are demanded on the part of the knowing subject besides a certain development of the intellectual powers, namely, a certain quality of character and disposition, an attitude of trustful, sympathetic insight which is more than purely intellectual perception. Treat a person simply as an object or thing after the manner of the natural scientist, and the natural scientific method of investigation, trying to fit him as we do things or objects into a system or scheme of understanding, and you will never know him as a person much less as a friend. To do that you must give him your trust, your sympathy, in a word yourself. In other words, you must respond to his personality with your own total personality, and only in the degree in which you do this will your knowledge of him be true or adequate. Which means that moral and spiritual conditions as well as purely intellectual are necessary for knowledge of a person, for what we call personal knowledge.

Now what is true of the knowledge of human persons is most of all true of the knowledge of the supreme Divine Personality whom we call God, the knowledge with which we are concerned in religion. In this case *par excellence* a certain attitude of the heart and disposition, a certain degree of moral affinity, of sympathetic and trustful relationship, is necessary as well as or in addition to a certain development of the intelligence or understanding. This is what the old theologians meant by saying *pectus facit theologum*, 'the heart makes the theologian.' Religious knowledge, the knowledge of God and things spiritual, that is to say, is conditioned, morally and spiritually conditioned, in a way and to a degree in which natural scientific knowledge is not. The objects of the latter are accessible to the mind apart from qualifications of moral character or spiritual sympathy, demanding only a certain degree of development of the rational understanding. But in religious knowledge we are concerned with a subject-matter which cannot be properly apprehended or appreciated, cannot be properly known indeed, apart from a certain condition or attitude of the heart and the conscience and the will. As the Old Testament Psalmist put it, 'The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him' (Ps 25^{14}). Or as Jesus Himself is recorded as putting it, 'If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching' (Jn 7^{17}). And to like effect Paul the Christian apostle: 'The natural man' (ὁ ψυχικός, as we would say to-day, the merely intellectual man as opposed to or contrasted with ὁ πνευματικός, the spiritual man) 'receiveth not the things of the Spirit, neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned' (1 Co 2^{14}). This is what Ritschlians, followers of Albrecht Ritschl, meant by speaking of religious knowledge as consisting in what they call 'judgments of worth' or of 'value,' judgments of appreciation or what they sometimes, though a little misleadingly, spoke of as 'faith judgments,' as opposed to scientific knowledge as consisting in what they called 'judgments of fact' or of 'existence.' By this distinction they meant—though some followers of Ritschl expressed the matter in a rather unfortunate way—not that religious knowledge is less true or objective, less objectively true and valid, than scientific knowledge, as though faith were a kind of blind trust which has to be substituted for knowledge proper. It is rather that the knowledge of its truth or certainty is attained in a different way, by a different avenue from that of scientific truth. Once attained, religious truth, truth determined by moral and spiritual and not merely intellectual conditions, is as true, as objective, as objectively true, and is knowledge in as true and full a sense as any knowledge of nature; and has to be related to it, united harmoniously with it, in one coherent system of truth, truth being ultimately one because God is one.

IV.

Religion then has its facts, its objective scientific facts we may say—meaning by this that it deals with facts which can be repeated and verified by any who fulfil the proper conditions of its knowledge—just as much as any other realm of human experience, though indeed the knowledge of these facts is conditioned in a way in which what is ordinarily called scientific knowledge is not. And because of this, as B. H. Streeter has said, 'No philosophy (or total view of reality) can hold water which has not sympathetically studied, and in its system found a place for, the historical and psychological phenomena in which religion has found expression' (*The Spirit*, p. x).

This religious knowledge, the knowledge of God and of spiritual things, which we have through religion or religious experience as the experience of fellowship with God, is a knowledge, it should be added and emphasized, which is as direct and immediate as the knowledge of any other realm of facts, and not merely a knowledge argued to by way of inference from and explanation of these facts. By which I mean this. We may endeavour to argue to God, and to a knowledge about God, His existence and nature, from the character of the world in which we find ourselves. So men have endeavoured to do in all ages. From evidences of power and intelligence and rational and moral order in the world, men have endeavoured to argue to the existence of a great supreme intelligent and moral Power at the heart of things,

ordinarily called God. This was the essence of the old ' theistic arguments,' as they were called, those arguments with which so-called ' natural theology ' dealt. And, the criticism of Kant and the more recent criticism of Karl Barth notwithstanding, these arguments are not without their worth or value. They are so many analyses from different points of view of the rational constituents of man's faith in God, indicating in various ways that the world and experience cannot be rationally construed or ' made sense of ' without the hypothesis of a supreme Intelligence and Moral Will over all whom we call God. But such arguments do not give us properly religious knowledge. They give us at best knowledge *about* God rather than knowledge *of* God. The knowledge arrived at in this way is but a cold hypothesis to explain the world, not a warm and living reality and certainty such as we know through the properly religious experience of communion or fellowship with Him. As Cardinal Newman, whom I quoted at the beginning of this article, put it at the close of his *Apologia* : ' I am far from denying the real force of the arguments in proof of a God, drawn from the general facts of human society, but these do not warm me or enlighten me ; they do not take away the winter of my desolation, or make the buds unfold and the leaves grow within me and my moral being rejoice.' The knowledge of God's existence and character which is properly called religious knowledge is not inferential or argumentative, but experiential or experimental. It is not as the result of inference or as the conclusion of an argument that the knowledge of God's reality comes to us, but through the experience of communion with Him. We come to know God as we know a friend, and a friend's reality is not demonstrated by argument but established by personal contact and fellowship. This point is interestingly put and expressed by Eddington in his book entitled *Science and the Unseen World* in these words : ' In the case of our human friends we take their existence for granted, not caring whether it is proven or not. Our relationship is such that we could read philosophical arguments designed to prove the non-existence of each other, and perhaps even be convinced by them—and then laugh together over so odd a conclusion. I think that it is something of the same kind of security we should seek in our relationship with God. The most flawless proof of the existence of God is no substitute for it, and if we have that relationship the most convincing disproof is turned harmlessly aside. If I may say it with reverence, the soul and God laugh together over so odd a conclusion ' (p. 43).

This means that in the matter of religious knowledge the true expert is not the scientist or philosopher who has specialized in other fields or departments of knowledge. Because one is an expert and is recognized as an expert in some other science—in geology or in biology, *e.g.*, or even in psychology, to take the sciences mentioned earlier —this in itself is no guarantee that his judgment is to be respected or followed in the realm of properly religious knowledge. Great harm is often done to religious truth and reality by what has been not incorrectly characterized as the ' woefully amateurish ' remarks of men who may be authorities in their own line or department of study but are sadly ignorant and uneducated in the realm of religious truth and knowledge. As it has been aptly said : ' The religious opinions of the irreligious are not more worthy of attention than the scientific opinions of the unscientific.' Even the expert in psychology or anthropology is not thereby or simply on that account qualified to give an authoritative judgment on religious matters. Courses on religion or about religion are sometimes given in the department of psychology or anthropology or even of comparative religion which are simply irreligious in character, in that they proceed upon the assumption that religion is simply a function of human nature, and can be presented in a simply anthropocentric humanistic fashion, giving us in the end ' religion without God.' Indeed this point of view or attitude is sometimes presented as the alone properly scientific undogmatic attitude, the ' high ' religious attitude of a scientific age. Whereas it is really the outcome and evidence of a philosophical dogmatism which does not allow the facts of religious experience to speak for themselves and have their proper determinative influence in any system of adequate education such as a University should seek to supply.

V.

To the proposal to include Theology in a University curriculum it is sometimes objected further that this is almost inevitably to introduce sectarianism or denominationalism into University thought and life. With such a fear we will all, I think, readily sympathize—the fear of sectarian or denominational indoctrination, with the ecclesiastical domination and limitation of the freedom of intellectual scientific inquiry involved. In reference to this objection, however, it must be said that even if Theology is excluded from a University curriculum on this ground, this provides no real guarantee that thereby Theology is actually excluded from academic influence. Indeed, man being what he is, as Newman himself observed in the Essay already referred to, Theology in some form or other cannot be excluded from a University education, and the professed exclusion too often works only to the inclusion of a false or

inadequate Theology not usually recognized or acknowledged indeed as Theology because it is essentially irreligious or secularistic thinking. The very dominance of the scientific way of thinking, with its assumption that the scientific account of the universe is the only avenue to a true knowledge of reality, and its refusal to take into account the whole realm of values, æsthetic, moral, and spiritual —save indeed in so far as they are subjective human experiences and thus material for the science of Psychology—lands us in a scientific naturalism or secularistic humanism which has leavened our whole modern civilized thinking. No, the course of prudence as well as of sound educational policy is to supply within a University curriculum the provision for a sound teaching in Theology by those who can claim to be experts in this region of knowledge, and who through a proper training and discipline in scientific method in this field of religious knowledge have the same right to be trusted in the realm of religious knowledge as the natural scientist in the realm of physical knowledge.

This matter of the place of Theology in a University curriculum—it may be emphasized in closing—is a matter of special interest and concern at the present time when, chiefly through the revelation of the tragic insufficiency of a wholly secularized scientific education as illustrated in particular in the case of Nazi Germany, we have been brought to realize as probably never before in history, the place of religion in education, the centrality indeed of religion to education. Religion, we have come to realize more and more with the progress of the present world struggle, is not after all just one department of education, not just one among other possible subjects in a University course, it is the central determining and integrating principle of all departments. And because this is so, Theology as the science of religion should have a central organizing integrating place among the disciplines of a University education, inasmuch as it is concerned with the central truths and convictions by which men and nations live, truths and convictions as to the meaning of life, the nature of man and the existence and character of God, the ultimate reality. These are the central questions of thought and life about which all other questions more narrowly scientific cluster and are organized, questions, for example, as to how the world came to take the form it has and the laws of the world on the different levels of its being. These more scientific questions deal only with a section or fraction, with different sections or fractions, of reality. And a University curriculum which deals only with such questions, and with such questions often in a very specialized, isolated, or disunited way, turns out from its halls of learning men and women who from the point of view of a true, full cultural education are not educationally properly integrated, are indeed, as some one has said, not proper 'integers' but too often mere 'vulgar fractions.' In their beginnings in the Middle Ages, Universities gave Theology with its view of life a central place, but in more recent times under the undue prominence of the physical sciences this perspective has been largely lost. If the Universities of to-day and to-morrow are to play their proper part in education for good and true citizenship, Theology must be restored to its central place in the determination of a true philosophy of life. So it is significant to notice that, in the Report on Post-War University Education issued recently by the Committee of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, this Committee, impressed by the tendency of University curricula under the undue emphasis of scientific studies to develop specialization in education without any integrating principle among the different departments of study, defined the ultimate aim of University education as being, in the words of Professor A. N. Whitehead, 'to construct a system of ideas which brings the æsthetic, moral, and religious interests into relation with those concepts of the world which have their origin in natural science' (*Process and Reality*, p. vi.), and thus to fuse the whole into one rational rounded scheme of thought and purpose.

Literature.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF REVELATION.

Conservative theologians of the present day tend to be Catholic with the neo-Thomists or Protestant with the neo-Evangelicals. The difference between the two tendencies may be brought out in various ways. A very good way is to compare them in respect of their doctrines of revelation. If the comparison is to yield contrasts as pronounced as possible, then it may well be between the teaching of St. Thomas himself on this subject and that of Karl Barth; the one furnishes the standard Catholic view, and the other an emphatic and extreme Protestant view.

This is the comparative task undertaken by the

author of *The Word as Truth* (Lutterworth Press ; 10s. 6d. net). He is the Rev. A. M. Fairweather, Grantown-on-Spey, one of the younger ministers of the Church of Scotland. With the publication of this volume he joins the ranks, not overcrowded in Scotland, of systematic theologians. For his work contains more than a comparison of the teachings of Thomas Aquinas and Karl Barth on the subject of revelation ; it carries out a critical comparison, and in doing so expounds his own constructive view. We find as we follow his exposition that he would have us learn both of Thomas Aquinas and of Karl Barth ; like many conservative theologians among Protestants he would, however, have us respect Barth's religious intuition but react from his characteristic theological and anthropological standpoints.

An introductory discussion of the meaning and nature of revelation leads to a critical examination of the Thomist view as found in the *Summa Contra Gentiles*, to be followed by a critical examination of the Barthian view as found chiefly in *Church Dogmatics*, I. (Eng. tr., G. T. Thomson). Then the Old and New Testament teachings concerning revelation are examined, and the way thus further prepared for the thesis the author would sustain.

For he has a definite thesis to sustain. (Indeed his work has in large measure the character, not to say the sobriety of form, of an academic dissertation.) The thesis is that of the essential mediacy of God's self-disclosure to man. Which is to say, that revelation even when rationalized and transmitted through human agencies retains its divinely given character and its capacity to direct the life of faith ; it is still a Word of God to us, it possesses the form of truth. It is this thesis that underlies the title of the work.

The book might have been arranged in more attractive form ; but the style is clear and logical, and if the matter is difficult in places it repays careful reading. In our view, however, the unity of the book is somewhat impaired by the addition of the chapter on ' The Will of God and the Christian Metaphysic.' The result is a certain tameness, and even lameness, in the conclusion. A good deal of adjustment would be needed to bring this chapter into close and vital relation with the chapters preceding.

We shall not discuss Mr. Fairweather's thesis, which appears to be reasonable enough, but we would offer a cordial welcome to his book, and quote a few typical sentences from its culminating chapter on ' The Implications of Mediacy ' : ' The function of " truth," to which Barth does not appear to do justice, is the function asserted by Aquinas in his tenet that in the last analysis revelation must commend itself to the human reason. . . . The " Yes " or " No " with which we respond to God's approach is intellectual as well as moral. It may be that the intellectual " Yes " or " No " is ultimately dependent on our moral bearing in as much as what we can appreciate must depend on what we ourselves are, morally and spiritually. But the intellectual pronouncement must be made, and made by ourselves. This being a human pronouncement, Barth cannot give it its due place and significance, and consequently cannot allow its proper value to the Word as truth.'

W. FULTON.

THE DIVINE REALM.

Most readers of those profound pages, *The Divine Realm*, by Mr. Evgueny Lampert, D.Phil. (Faber & Faber ; 8s. 6d. net), may do well to hasten up the rather long and formal avenue which is the first part of the book, slow down toward the end of that section, and browse for long in the rich pastures of sections II. and III. Certainly the earlier pages are necessary to the argument, but might they perhaps be more condensed and less technical ? Especially may this be said in view of the part assigned to faith in this pilgrimage of thought. Lampert here finds his place in the Platonic tradition, which is proper, he himself declares, to a certain style of thinking, sought for, both instinctively and consciously, in Russian religious thought. Truth, in Plato's philosophy, is ultimately not proved or demonstrated, so much as shown. We remember the ' sweet hope ' of old Cephalus, ' which guides the wayward thought of mortal man,' and the Vision of Er, descending, in sublime dramatic contrast, upon the Categories of the understanding in the latter half of the tenth Book of the Republic. ' Do not,' says Lampert, ' philosophy and theology belong altogether rather to the sphere of mythology than to that of syllogisms and intellectual distinctions, and does not at the basis of all genuine human thought lie—*horribile dictu !*—a myth ? '

How do we enter the Kingdom of God, the Divine Realm ? That is the dread question with which the writer of this noble essay wrestles, until he finds that faith and knowledge unite in witnessing to the sacramental miracle ' the perpetual creative sacramental action of God in the world and in man,' as being in its own reality that Realm which we seek. For though life is indeed a pilgrimage, it is such on the part of the Divine, no less than on the part of man. All Creation is the pilgrim way. Creation is a path flung through the abyss, for the journeyings of God to man, of man to God. The human eye (how nearly infinite in its intricate beauty and power) has not yet evolved sufficiently to look upon the Very Presence of God. The human ear that in Nature and in music hears something already beyond human understanding has not yet heard the very Voice of its Maker. But wherever, upon this highway of Creation, man becomes conscious of the Presence —through sound, through beauty in Nature and in art, through sex, through sacrifice and death—there is the sacramental instant, there man meets God, and God meets man.

And the more man becomes alive to this sacramental existence transcending himself, emptying himself, fulfilling himself, the more is he suffused with the grace of God. Now, encountering his fellowmen, he can become to them in some degree a priest and a minister of the sacrament of the Presence. This act of self-surrender, this *transcende te ipsum*, in most lives a rare spring-tide of

being, was in one life sustained. In Christ we find the sacrament, the encounter, and response poised in perfect union. And therefore Christ regards us with the eyes of God, His heart beats for us with the heart of God, and when Christ speaks it is the voice of God we hear, and yet He remains a man, a comrade.

In such an event, rather than in social and political progress and decline, is History matured and fulfilled. 'History,' says Lampert, 'is fulfilled above all in the Divine-human events of God's revelation in time and space: in the Incarnation and the Cross, in the Resurrection and the descent of the Holy Spirit; and in the eternal symbols of these events: in the sacraments, in which the presence and action of God in cosmic life is focused. The fate of this world is directly or indirectly determined by the destiny of Christ's Church, by her sacramental and sacramentally creative transfiguring power. The sacrament may thus be regarded as the soul of the life of the created universe and of human history. The bond between the world and the sacrament lies so deep that it remains hidden and invisible to unregenerated man; but, though it always remains a mystery, it is disclosed in revelation and known to faith. Religious awareness sees history through eyes other than those of the historian of civilisation or the sociologist. Maybe, beneath the thunder of war and world catastrophes, unknown to many, there is taking place something more definite, decisive, and essential for the world itself, than all the earthquakes overtaking European civilisation. History will be fulfilled not by the fall of states and the establishment of a world society complete with democracy and civilisation. All this in itself is dust, and only has meaning in relation to that which is taking place in the depth of creaturely existence, between God and man, between God and the world.'

EDITH ANNE ROBERTSON.

THE FORTUNES OF CHRISTIANITY.

The Unquenchable Light [The William Belden Noble Lectures in Harvard University, for 1940], by Kenneth S. Latourette, Professor of Oriental History in Yale University (Eyre & Spottiswoode; 7s. 6d. net).

World Church, by John Foster, Professor of Church History in the Selly Oak Colleges (S.C.M.; 6s. net).

Professor Latourette is the author of the great work, 'A History of the Expansion of Christianity,' of which six volumes have already been published. He is described in the publisher's blurb to this book as 'Christianity's greatest living historian.' *The Unquenchable Light* is not a summary of the larger work, but is based on it, and a good deal of the freedom and assurance with which the lesser work is written arises from the investigations which lie behind the writer's outlook. His purpose in the smaller book is to survey the changing fortunes of Christianity and the Christian Church throughout its whole history and incidentally to discover what its prospects are to-day. He is concerned with the influence of Jesus, the processes by which it has spread, and the reasons for its gains and for its ebb in some periods and areas. There have been advance and recession with great regularity, the initial advance up to A.D. 500, then the first and greatest recession from 500 to 950, followed by the second great advance from 950 to 1350, the second major recession 1350 to 1500, the third great age of advance 1500 to 1750, the third major recession 1750 to 1815, the fourth great age of advance 1815 to 1914, and finally the latest age 1914 to the present. Each of these periods has a chapter to itself, and Professor Latourette describes with rapid pen the chief causes of advance and decline in each case, and to the mastery of his material is due the fascination of this narrative. The big things stand out and we see the current flowing and ebbing and sometimes disappearing in stagnant and evaporating pools at the bank of the stream.

It is a wonderful story and for the believer one full of encouragement, for two reasons. As the story goes on we find one cardinal fact clearly manifest. The recessions never go back as far as the starting-point of the previous advance. The advances grow bigger and the recessions smaller, so that the point reached in 1914 is much higher than the beginning of the Christian era. The other reason is that behind the whole story is the living personality of Jesus.

Professor Foster brings out clearly the cardinal fact referred to by a diagram. He adopts Professor Latourette's divisions and conclusions and becomes even more optimistic in his survey than the latter. In general he owes a good deal to the big work of the American Professor, a debt that is freely acknowledged. But there is much that is his own and that goes beyond Professor Latourette's province. In his survey of the World Church, Professor Foster deals helpfully with such subjects as Scientific Humanism, Eschatology and the Kingdom of God, and the Church and its divisions. His solution of the problem of Church unity is sensible and attractive. Our 'unhappy divisions' might be transformed into happy diversity within one Church order, distinctive views and practices remaining so long as the essentials of the historic faith are held in common. This points to a federation of churches rather than a union, which in the end is the probable outcome of our negotiations.

It should be added that in both books the conclusion is reached that a survey of history warrants a strongly optimistic outlook on the future. 'It appears reasonably certain,' says Professor Latourette, 'that Jesus will have a growing influence in the life of mankind.' 'The reason for looking back over history,' says Professor Foster, 'is that we may learn to look forward with hope and to look upward with confidence.'

F. J. RAE.

Hero or Fool, by Mr. G. Rostrevor Hamilton (Allen & Unwin; 2s. net), is a critical study of Milton's Satan. It is largely directed against the

view of Mr. C. S. Lewis, who, in his 'Preface to Paradise Lost,' so the writer thinks, 'descends to the most intemperate and unfair arts of prosecution, writing into the Miltonic text what simply is not there.' His own view of Milton's conception of Satan is that 'when he allows free scope to his imagination, he presents us with an evil figure of real magnificence, in whom the great vices, although dominant, are shot through with great and substantial virtues. But the stern moralist, who could not fail to see with what glory the image of Satan was being clothed, keeps a vigilant eye on the poet.' The little book is full of fresh ideas and acute criticism, presented in a most attractive way.

Between Ourselves (Epworth Press; 6s. net), by the Rev. Leslie F. Church, B.A., Ph.D., the well-known Methodist leader, consists of a series of Letters to his Brethren written in the stress of war. They obviously came from his heart, and they were written to uphold his brethren in difficult and often lonely tasks. The volume is embellished with ten photographic illustrations. As one reads through the letters, beginning with 'In Quest of Good Cheer' (June 1939) and ending with 'Eve of Victory' (October 1944), one gains not only an impression of the development of the war but is brought into contact with a mature Christian mind; and one also realizes that here is a man quick to observe, apt to recall, who, like the householder in the Gospels, brings forth out of his treasure things new and old. We would remark in particular upon the wealth of literary and historical instance contained within those pages, in which a preacher may well find reward.

Living Worship (Eyre & Spottiswoode; 4s. 6d. net), by the Rev. David G. Peck, Vicar of Little Bedwyn, Wilts, belongs to the series of Lent Books that Dr. Temple began at York and continued at Canterbury. Canon A. E. Baker describes Mr. Peck in the Editorial Note as 'among the more able of the younger writers of the Church of England.' Certainly the volume before us goes far to justify this opinion. It is in a thoughtful setting that the subject of worship is presented, and the author is a staunch upholder of Anglican forms.

Mr. Peck is very insistent on the place and value of form in worship; so insistent that he will not carry all his readers with him. At the very outset of his book this insistency is adumbrated in his description of worship as 'a deliberate acknowledgment of God by man, couched in regular and specific religious acts.' As the book proceeds his positions are developed with clarity and vigour. He speaks not only of the necessity of forms, but of the shape and body they give to the movements of the spirit. 'The services of the Church, with their ritual, ceremonial, symbolism, and sacrament, are not only the forms of worship, but actually worship.' In other words, the forms of worship and the inner idea of worship cannot be separated.

In his discussions of the belief within worship, man's relation to things, and man's relation to man, as indeed in his first discussion, the meaning of worship, Mr. Peck shows himself to be a diligent and discriminating student of the relevant recent literature; while his concluding discussion, the hope in worship, would teach us that in a time of disintegration there is a 'Divine Architecture' shining above the chaos, in a world adrift there is a Rock against which neither death nor hell can prevail.

Professor Daniel Lamont, D.D., has written a booklet on *God the Redeemer*. It is the third of the series of 'Vital Issues,' published by the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions (6d.). In substance it is an expansion of a chapter in the writer's book, 'The Anchorage of Life,' and it treats of its subject under three heads—Redemption as a Past Event, as a Present Experience, and as a Future Hope. It is characterized by solid thinking, clear exposition and fidelity to the Scripture record. In the writer's view, 'that which is an offence to the natural man is the heart of the truth and the fountain of joy to the man in Christ. The Church of God will recover its power and influence when and only when it ceases to accommodate itself to modern forms of unbelief and when it returns, through the prayer of faith, to the glowing certitude of the Apostles who have passed on to us the glorious Gospel of our divine Redeemer.'

A book that deals with the union of the churches from an unusual angle is *The Way of At-one-ment*, by the Rev. W. J. Phythian-Adams, D.D., Canon of Carlisle (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net). Dr. Phythian-Adams thinks that all the churches have erred theologically and have therefore barred the way to reunion. The way back is by a sound theology. He gives us three creeds, that is to say three ways of interpreting the Biblical facts. The first is the objective or 'Catholic.' It emphasizes the sacramental element, the Church and a valid ministry. The second is the subjective or 'Protestant,' emphasizing conversion and the way of repentance and faith, with the Word of God given a prominent place. These two views he reconciles in a third creed, where baptism, repentance and faith, the Church, Holy Communion and a universal ministry are combined. In this universal ministry there is a *personal* ministry and at the same time an *instrumental* one. It is assumed that the Church system will be Episcopal, but in that system both personal and instrumental can be united. The book is an interesting contribution to a living subject, and, even if all its statements do not meet with agreement, it is by such honest efforts at understanding and Christian compromise that some tolerable solution will be reached.

The Divine Healer.[1]

By the Right Reverend A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D., Bishop of Derby.

It is characteristic of the modern mind that it tends to view things historically, and to ask, with regard to religious beliefs no less than with regard to other aspects of human life, the question, 'How did they arise?' Religious beliefs often have lowly origins. The most important question which ought to be asked about them is not 'How did they arise?' but 'Are they true?' In the last resort, if we are Christians, we must believe that Religion rests on Revelation, in the sense that the eternal and living God has throughout a long sequence of history made Himself known through His interpretative 'Word' spoken by prophets 'in diverse fragmentary ways,' and that His finally decisive 'Word' has been spoken to the human race in and through Jesus Christ, in whom the 'Word' became 'flesh.' But the process was a long one; and, on the strictly historical level, questions of origins have their own interest. It is in part, at least, with a question of the possible historical origins of a particular element in the Jewish and Christian conception of God that this paper will be concerned. From what source, it may be asked, did the Hebrews derive the conception of God as the Divine Healer, the God who 'killeth and maketh alive,' who 'bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up'[2]? Is it possible to trace any affinity between this particular belief and the religious cults of the neighbouring peoples with whom the Israelites in early times were in contact?

It is of course, in a general way, natural enough for men to think both of disease and of recovery from disease as being bound up with their relation to the supernatural power or powers with which, or with whom, through their religion they believe themselves to be in contact. Yet it is doubtful whether in the religion of the Hebrews, as it came into Palestine from the desert, the idea of Jehovah or Yahweh as the Divine Healer of His people's diseases was at all specially prominent. The narratives of the Pentateuch in their present form reflect largely the religious outlook of a later period. The story of the healing of Miriam's leprosy in Nu 12 may be cited: it probably belongs to 'J,' and may go back to the ninth century B.C. Conversely the narratives of the Plagues of Egypt ascribe to Jehovah the power to affect men with boils, to cause murrain among the cattle, and to bring about the death of the first-born. There is also the story of the Brazen Serpent, of which more hereafter. In general, however, I believe what has been said above to be broadly true.

The period of the Exodus was indeed decisive and formative. The deliverance of the clans from the bitter bondage of Egypt lived in the memory and in the folk-traditions of later times as the most signal instance of the power of the Lord to redeem and deliver His people, and to vindicate Himself as their Saviour. There had moreover been something which happened at Sinai—perhaps, among other things, a volcanic eruption, but also more: the Lord, disclosed from the shuddering mountain in majesty and terror, had through His interpreter Moses entered into a special relationship with the Hebrews, whereby they became specifically His 'people': and the 'Covenant' involved obligations. The Mosaic Law is of later development, but the germs of it were already there. The Lord of power was, from the period of Sinai onwards, also and equally the God of righteousness. Apart from this, the idea which would appear to have been most prominent in the religious thought of this primitive period is that of the Lord as a God of war, the Inspirer of battle frenzy, the Giver of military victory. The religion of Israel, as it was brought into Palestine from the desert, was an austere and stern faith.

By contrast the religion of the Canaanite peoples of Palestine was of a quite different type—licentious, idolatrous, and polytheistic; involving in each settled locality the worship of a god known as the 'baal' or 'lord,' who, with his goddess consort, was conceived primarily as the divine 'owner' or lord of the fruitful soil, the giver of fertility alike to cattle and to crops and to mankind, the god of vegetation and of increase. The fusion of the incoming faith of the conquering Israelites with the indigenous Canaanite cults led to a real degradation of the former, and for a time Yahweh or Jehovah Himself came to be thought of and to be worshipped in each locality as the owner or 'baal' of the soil which He had conquered, with what were in effect the old Canaanite rites. There is plenty of evidence of this in the Old Testament; but in the end the successive prophets who, in the name of the austere God of righteousness, challenged and fought against the prevailing syncretism succeeded in winning their

[1] The substance of this paper was read to a gathering of clergy and doctors at Leicester in January of this year.

[2] 1 S 2[6].

victory. The God whose name was Jealous,[1] who was 'of purer eyes than to behold iniquity,'[2] and whose worship (it was insisted) must be image-less, prevailed over His rivals, and was established as the sole object of Israel's worship. But the struggle was a long one, the victory was not easily won, and, so far as the popular mind was concerned, the issue of monotheism was not finally decided until after the Exile. In the 8th chapter of Ezekiel there is a passage in which the prophet, himself in Babylon, to his horror sees in a vision the abominations still practised in Jerusalem. There are animal-worshippers; there is a group of sun-worshippers; and there are also women 'weeping for Tammuz.'[3]

The name Tammuz is Babylonian, and the god Tammuz seems to have been originally a vegetation or fertility spirit, of whom the story was told that he had died and come to life again. The mourning women of Jerusalem were apparently engaged in a ritual in which his death was bewailed. The same, or a similar, deity was worshipped in Syria under the title or name of Adonis: the Phœnicians of Sidon and the neighbouring coast region venerated an identical or kindred divinity, Esmun. The cults of Adonis and Esmun have been studied elaborately by a modern scholar, who believes that Adonis, or Esmun, as being a deity who, according to the legend, had himself died and come to life, was credited with the power of restoring life to the dead, and of delivering from death those who were in danger of dying.'[4] Whatever be the origin of the belief, it appears certain that the god Esmun was widely regarded as a healing divinity, the restorer of life and of vitality to those who were sick: and there appear to be grounds also for the belief that his cult was in some way connected with that of the serpent.[5] The affinity is obvious with the Greek Asklepios and the Latin Aesculapius, and therewith ultimately with the emblem or badge of the Royal Army Medical Corps. But is it not difficult to avoid thinking also, in the same connexion, of the story (to which allusion has already been made) of the setting up by Moses of the Serpent of Brass in the wilderness?

The story, as it appears in the Book of Numbers,[6] is a curious one. The Israelites, as the penalty of their 'murmurings,' are afflicted by a plague of fiery serpents whose bite is fatal. Moses, at God's command, sets up a Serpent of Brass on a standard, and those who fix their gaze upon it recover. The serpent is here a mere emblem, set up in a particular connexion and on a particular occasion at the specific command of Israel's God. Its function is to play a part in the cure of men suffering from snake-bite, as though on the principle of a sort of primitive homœopathy. In the New Testament it becomes a type of our Lord on the Cross—'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up': [7] and, for Christians, that is the ultimate spiritual meaning of the tale. But as it stands written in the Old Testament, may it not be that it represents what might perhaps best be described as the rationalization—and the rendering theologically harmless—of some originally pagan worship, in which the serpent played the part of a healing god?

The suggestion might be thought far-fetched, were it not for the occurrence in the Second Book of the Kings of a passage which affords definite evidence of a serpent cult at Jerusalem as late as the time of King Hezekiah. That monarch (we are told) in the course of his campaign of religious reform, 'brake in pieces the brasen serpent which Moses had made: for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and it was called Nehushtan.'[8] To the reforming zeal of King Hezekiah and his advisers the cult of Nehushtan with good reason appeared frankly idolatrous. But it is clear that, right down to his date (727–695 B.C.), it had enjoyed a considerable vogue. In the conflict between rival forms of religion, it happens not seldom that the faith which eventually prevails takes over and re-affirms in the context of its own interpretation of God (sometimes by way of what is described as an oppositional claim) ideas and conceptions which in effect may be said to constitute virtually an unacknowledged and indirect debt to the religion which has been overcome and supplanted. Did the conception of God as the Divine Healer, the Deliverer from sickness and from death, originally take shape and acquire prominence in the religious outlook of Israel by way of an oppositional claim made on Jehovah's behalf, and directed against the ascription of healing powers to the gods of surrounding and neighbouring peoples? It is of interest to note that at the beginning of the Second Book of the Kings, when King Ahaziah of Judah, injured by a fall through a window and bed-ridden, sends messengers to 'Baal-zebub the god of Ekron' (a deity whose name re-appears in the New Testament as a designation of the 'prince of the demons'[9]) to ask whether or not he would recover, the king's messengers on their return journey are intercepted by the prophet Elijah and sent back to their master with the indignant question, 'Is it because there is no god in Israel,

[1] Ex 34^{14}. [2] Hab 1^{13}. [3] Ezk 8^{14}.
[4] W. W. von Baudissin, *Adonis und Esmun* (Leipzig, 1911). I owe to von Baudissin's book much of the information and not a few of the ideas contained in this paper.
[5] Von Baudissin, *op. cit.*, 325 ff. [6] Nu 21^{4-9}.
[7] Jn 3^{14}. [8] 2 K 18^{4} (R.V.m.).
[9] Mt 12^{24} and parallels.

that ye go to inquire of Baal-zebub the god of Ekron?' Had the god of Ekron repute as a healing god? Was that why King Ahaziah resorted to him, rather than to the God of Israel? In any case, the messengers are bidden inform him that (as the penalty, it is to be presumed, of his religious apostasy in seeking help from a foreign god) he is not destined to recover, but 'shall surely die.'[1]

Whatever be the final verdict with regard to the original source of the idea, certain it is that the conception of God as the Healer of His people's diseases is of fairly frequent occurrence in the Old Testament. 'I am the Lord that healeth thee'—so runs an Old Testament passage[2]; and, in the Book of Numbers, Moses prays on behalf of his sister Miriam, when the latter is smitten with leprosy, 'Heal her, O God, I beseech thee.'[3] So in the Second Book of the Kings, Hezekiah, stricken with a sickness which appeared to be mortal, prays to the Lord with tears, whereupon the prophet Isaiah is charged with the message, 'Thus saith the Lord, the God of David thy father, I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears: behold, I will heal thee.'[4] In such passages the reference is quite clearly to healing or to recovery, in a *literal* sense, from disease: and despite the modern tendency to regard the Psalms (even the most personal of them) as having from the very beginning been composed for use in public worship, and as intended therefore to give expression to the voice of corporate Israel, rather than to the experiences of any particular individual, it is difficult not to believe that there is personal experience of recovery from dangerous illness behind the Psalmist's words when he writes—'O Lord my God, I cried unto thee, and thou hast healed me. O Lord, thou hast brought up my soul from Sheol: thou hast kept me alive, that I should not go down to the pit.'[5] There are other passages which might be quoted, in which a reference to literal healing is either possible or probable.[6] Especially frequent, however, is the reference (often, in this case, in a metaphorical sense) to God as the healer of His people's wounds[7]; and often the wounds which are thus healed by God are said to have been themselves inflicted or sent by Him—'He maketh sore, and bindeth up: he woundeth, and his hands make whole.'[8]

God, in a word, is, according to the Old Testament teaching and outlook, the Lord both of life and of death; sickness and healing are alike sent by Him; and since to be seriously ill is to have embarked already upon a course which may lead to death, to 'kill' and to 'make alive' become, in the language of Scripture, expressions synonymous respectively with the causation of sickness and with its cure. Thus in the Second Book of the Kings when the King of Syria sends the leper Naaman to the King of Israel with the request that he would heal him, the King of Israel indignantly asks, 'Am I God, to kill and to make alive, that this man doth send unto me to recover a man of his leprosy?'[9] So, too, in the Gospels, when our Lord, about to heal a man on the Sabbath, asks His Pharisaic opponents 'Is it lawful on the sabbath day to do good, or to do harm? to save a life, or to kill?' the *primary* meaning of the second half of the verse is probably 'to heal a man, or to let him get worse,' though there is probably also a *double entendre*—'to save a life, as I am about to do, or to plot murder, as you are already doing in your hearts'[10]; and in St. John's Gospel our Lord's words to the 'nobleman' or 'king's officer' from Capernaum, 'Go thy way: thy son liveth,' are to be understood as meaning 'thy son is getting better.'[11] Since, moreover, there are indeed no limits to the power of God, it is in line with this conception of disease as already an incipient death, from which to bring about recovery is 'to make alive,' that the final form which the Divine power of healing may take is that of the restoration to life of those who have actually died. In the Old Testament, Elijah and Elisha are both credited with having raised dead bodies to life[12]; in the Acts, St. Peter restores life to Tabitha,[13] and St. Paul raises the young man Eutychus who was alleged to have been killed by a fall from a third storey window[14]; in the Gospels we have the cases of the daughter of Jairus,[15] of the widow's son at Nain,[16] and (in the Fourth Gospel) the story of Lazarus.[17]

If the question be asked what are we to think, as modern men, about these and other miracle stories in the Old and New Testaments, the wisest answer perhaps is that we do not know. What are we to think about modern Lourdes, or about ancient Epidaurus? In the atmosphere of religious faith, strange things do happen. Who shall set limits to the power of God? On the one hand, when once the position popularly known as 'Fundamentalism' has been abandoned, the winds of criticism begin to blow, and the possibilities of scepticism begin to emerge. On the other hand, when once the position has been taken up that the order of

[1] 2 K 1^{2-4}. [2] Ex 15^{26}. [3] Nu 12^{13}.
[4] 2 K 20^{1-5}. [5] Ps 30^{2-3}.
[6] *E.g.*, Pss 41^{3-4} 103^{3} 147^{3}.
[7] Is 30^{26}, Jer 30^{17}, Hos 6^{1}, Ps 147^{3}, Job 5^{18}.
[8] Job 5^{18}; cf. Is 30^{26}, Hos 6^{1}.
[9] 2 K 5^{7}. [10] Mk 3^{4}. [11] Jn 4^{50}.
[12] 1 K 17^{17-24} (Elijah raises the widow's son), 2 K 4^{18-37} (Elisha raises the Shunammite woman's son).
[13] Ac 9^{36-41}. [14] Ac 20^{9-12}.
[15] Mk 5^{35-43} and parallels. [16] Lk 7^{11-16}.
[17] Jn 11^{17-44}.

Nature has its ultimate basis not in any intrinsic or quasi-mechanical necessity but in the moral constancy of God, the possibility of miracle (in the sense of a departure, for adequate reasons, and in subordination to spiritual ends, from the normal course of the Divine working in Nature) cannot in principle be excluded. Admittedly the mind of the Biblical writers is pre-scientific and popular. They do not look at things in the way in which a modern scientifically trained mind would be accustomed to look at them. But in their clear-eyed and continuous recognition of the truth that, behind what *we* call the order of Nature, there is always the activity of God, do they not furnish a needed corrective to the depersonalized abstractions of the modern scientific world-outlook? The Biblical stories of miracle may not be able to be completely rationalized to our modern satisfaction, but I believe it to be a mistake simply upon this ground to reject them. The evidence, especially for many of the New Testament stories of miracle, must, simply as evidence, be considered to be rather strong. It is by no means easily to be eliminated. It is implicit in the earliest traditions; and in the New Testament age itself it was acknowledged without question, alike by friends and by foes. I believe that in the Biblical stories of miracle we are confronted by a problem to which we have no very satisfying solution, but a problem by which it is no bad thing that our modern scientific complacency of mind should be challenged.

A more fruitful question to ask with regard to these stories is the question 'What is their point?' It is obvious that they do not stand written in the pages of Scripture in the interests either of sheerly historical research or of natural science. They stand written, in the first instance, as the expression of a witness, borne in faith, to the healing and redemptive power of the living God; but, beyond this, the belief which they enshrine—the belief in God as the Lord of life and of death, the Divine Healer, who is able to rescue from sickness, and to deliver men's lives from the grave—afforded a language and terminology which in a metaphorical sense could be more widely applied. It was clear that the Lord of life and of death could deliver His people from captivity and exile, considered as a kind of national death—there could be a resurrection of the nation; and so, too, the Divine Healer could bind up the spiritual wounds of His people—He could show Himself able to heal the diseases not only of the body, but of the soul. 'Return, ye backsliding children,' writes Jeremiah, 'I will heal your backslidings.'[1] 'Let us return,' writes Hosea, 'to the Lord: for he hath torn, and he will heal us: he hath smitten, and he will bind us up.'[2] 'Heal my soul,' says the Psalmist, 'for I have sinned against thee.'[3] 'O Lord, heal me, for my bones are vexed.'[4] Or again, Hosea writes 'I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, where are thy plagues? O grave, where is thy destruction?'[5] And the great vision in the Book of Ezekiel of the resurrection of the nation from the valley of dry bones[6] is of course familiar.

In all or most of these prophetic passages the healing is spiritual, and the disease is of the soul: the death is the death of exile—exile from the Holy Land, which in terms of the spiritualizing thought of later times could be interpreted as exile from God. The symbolism, accordingly, of the healing of disease, and of deliverance from death and the grave, is in the outlook of later Judaism freely applied to the coming Day of Deliverance, in which God would decisively visit His people, and in which the Era of Final Salvation would dawn. 'Then,' in the words of a prophet, 'the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing.'[7]

The New Testament affirms that the Era of Final Salvation has dawned: and accordingly the miracles which the Gospel tradition ascribed to our Lord are by the Evangelists unhesitatingly set forth and interpreted as fulfilments of Scripture. That, and nothing else, is their primary evangelical significance. Whatever the historical basis of the stories—as to which we can only say that, alike by our Lord Himself and by His contemporaries, the occurrence of miracle is simply assumed as an indisputable fact—what they mean in the Gospels is that the Messianic Age has arrived, and that its appropriate accompanying 'signs' are, for those who have eyes to see, being openly manifested. The sick folk gathered about our Lord, and we read that 'the power of the Lord was with him to heal' them.[8] The evidence suggests that our Lord Himself, conscious of supernatural power, heals, in response to faith, from the motive primarily of compassion. But was that all? An Evangelist, by way of comment, applies to Him a version of some words from the 53rd chapter of Isaiah—'Himself took our infirmities, and bare our diseases.'[9] No doubt the application of the words is in the first instance meant to be to the literal cures which our Lord is said to have wrought; but that surely is not the whole or the essential point of the quotation. The fact that the words quoted form part, in their original context, of the description of the Lord's Servant, wounded for

[1] Jer 3^{22}. [2] Hos 6^{1}. [3] Ps 41^{4}. [4] Ps 6^{2}.
[5] Hos 13^{14}. [6] Ezk 37^{1-14}. [7] Is 35^{5-6}.
[8] Lk 5^{17}. [9] Mt 8^{17}; cf. Is 53^{4}.

others' transgressions, and bearing in His own body the 'chastisement' of their peace, conveys surely a plain hint that the miracles of healing ascribed to our Lord in the Gospels are deliberately intended to be read as having more than a merely literal significance. It is assumed indeed that they happened; but it is not simply as interesting historical examples of the cure of physical disease by non-physical means that the stories are told. The physical healing is meant to be understood as conveying a meaning beyond itself; it is what the Fourth Gospel calls it—a 'sign'; and what it symbolizes is the inbreaking of the Messianic Age, and the deeper healing of the soul. 'The physical miracles,' it has been strikingly written, 'are external signs of the supreme Messianic Miracle, the rescue of men from the grip of the powers of evil—from sin. The supreme Messianic Miracle to which the miracles point is the salvation of men by the power of the living God exercised through the agency of the Messiah.' [1]

Let me conclude this paper with a few words on the Christian attitude towards health and disease. Disease, suffering, and death are, in the thought-world of the Bible, all closely related to sin; and there are passages in Scripture which may be held to imply or to suggest that, if the world as we know it were not a fallen world, disease, suffering, and death would have been unknown. In the final phase of God's perfected Kingdom, the 'new heaven' and 'new earth' in which the redeemed are to share, we are assured that all tears shall have been wiped away, and that suffering and death shall be no more.[2] Yet in the world as it now is, disease, suffering, and death, all three have their part to play in the Divine ordering of things; and no one of the three is intrinsically evil, in the same absolute sense as that in which sin is evil. Christians are not meant to be hypochondriacs, and an excessive pre-occupation with questions of physical health and disease can very easily become morbid. It is in general right that a Christian should seek to keep physically fit: but on the other hand the call to accept physical disability, or to experience illness and pain, can be a true call from God; and through the acceptance and consecration of physical suffering it is possible for deep lessons to be learnt and for conspicuous victories in the realm of the spirit to be won.

It is the function of doctors and of the nursing profession to combat disease, and to seek to alleviate suffering; and that is right. But on the other hand, since 'it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this cometh judgement,' [3] it should be obvious that it is not invariably the will of God that the sick should recover, though there are modern heresies which have adopted the contrary view. Despite the considerable part played in the Gospels, and in early (and, to a lesser extent, also in later) Christian tradition, by real or apparent miracles of healing, interpreted as 'signs,' accompanying and authenticating the Church's primary Gospel of deliverance from the thraldom of sin and from alienation from God,[4] it does not seem to me to be a proper function of the Church to-day to engage in a campaign of what is sometimes called 'spiritual healing'—which in effect means the attempt to foster the expectation of a succession of cures of a miraculous or quasi-miraculous character, in the belief that such cures are for some reason more 'spiritual,' or more religiously edifying, than they would have been if they had been, under God, the result of the bringing to bear upon the patient's malady of the normal resources of medical science and skill. There is a passage indeed in the Second Book of the Chronicles in which a king of Judah who was 'diseased in his feet,' and whose 'disease was exceeding great,' is by implication blamed because 'in his disease he sought not to the Lord, but to the physicians.' [5] King Asa, it may be suggested, might with advantage have sought for relief in *both* these directions. The final and balanced scriptural word with regard to these matters is to be found in the great passage which the Church reads on St. Luke's Day from the Book Ecclesiasticus—the passage beginning 'Honour a physician according to thy need of him with the honours due unto him: for verily the Lord hath created him.' [6] The physician should practise his healing art in acknowledged dependence upon God, and in the spirit of religion. There should be the recognition that in this as in other spheres the decisive factor is the will of God, whose are the processes of Nature, and in whose hands are the issues of life and of death, so that in all things there should be submission to His will. Between the Church and its ministers on the one hand, and the members of the medical profession on the other, there should be co-operation within their respective spheres. But the Church should not go off at a tangent in the interests of mere miracle-mongering, or suggest that what the modern physician (if the facts are admitted at all) would probably describe as a cure by suggestion is, on the mere ground of the absence of physical means, to be regarded as more intrinsically 'spiritual' than a cure in which physical means are employed. It is a false philosophy which in this sense would contrast 'matter' with 'spirit.' To the Christian the whole of reality is in the last resort spiritual, in the sense that, in and through and behind the

[1] Hoskyns and Davey, *The Riddle of the New Testament*, 169.
[2] Rev 21^{3-4}. [3] He 9^{27}. [4] Mk 16^{20}. [5] 2 Ch 16^{12}. [6] Ecclus $38^{1ff.}$.

entire processes of Nature, the Divine Power is at work. Miracles, if they occur at all, are simply conspicuous events, in which, for those who have insight to discern what is happening, the 'arm of the Lord' is disclosed as being operative with a special directness and clarity. They are not ours to command, and they cannot be normal. What is important is that we should learn to glorify God, and to acknowledge His working, in the day to day processes of Nature, and in the normal and regular course of His Providence. Whether through the agency of the doctor or otherwise, it is true that 'from the Most High cometh healing,'[1] and that to the religious mind, and in the context of the Gospel, the healing of bodily disease is a fitting symbol and parable of the deeper healing of the soul.

[1] Ecclus 38^2.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Penicillin.

By the Reverend Canon T. H. W. Barker, Kempston Vicarage, Bedford.

'Thy son liveth.'—Jn 4^{50}.

A certain nobleman lived in a large, cool house, beside the Sea of Galilee. A king's officer, St. John calls him, and perhaps he was an administrator who as a young man had served as a soldier in the Roman Army. He was the father of a little boy who loved to play on the seashore, and who enjoyed bathing as much as other boys. One hot sunny day he stayed in the water too long, and forgot to put on his turban when he came out, and the fierce sun struck him—he got sunstroke.

His anxious father sent for the doctor, who did all he knew, but in those days that was little enough, When he left, the child's temperature was still very high, and the doctor could hold out small hopes of recovery.

The head servant ventured to approach the distracted nobleman.

'Sir,' he said, 'it may be only servants' gossip, but there is a slave in the kitchen who speaks of a wonder-worker who has been doing remarkable cures on sick people, and it is said that he has come into this district. I thought I should tell you in case it seemed worth while to send for him.'

The father made further inquiries, and determined to go himself to this Jesus. It was agony to free his hand from his little son's fevered grasp, but he must not let any chance slip. He mounted his horse and galloped over the rough road. It was a journey he felt he would never forget, every second taking him farther away from his darling.

At last he finds Jesus and beseeches Him to come down and heal his son. Jesus looks on him with great love, and with great love tests him.

'I am afraid,' He says to the father, 'you people will never believe on Me unless you see signs and wonders.'

'I don't want to see anything,' the father replies; 'I want you. Come down ere my child die.'

Jesus recognizes a true faith. Will it be matched with true obedience?

'Go home,' says Jesus, 'thy son liveth.'

And the nobleman went his way. The soldier in him heard the order as of one in authority, and obeyed at once. For him an order was an order. Mounting his horse again, he rode off with the words of Jesus ringing in his head, 'Thy son liveth, thy son liveth.' Jesus spoke to him in Greek, the *lingua franca*, and the galloping hoofs of the horse seemed to beat out the same words, *Ho huios sou ze, ho huios sou ze*. Every second now brought him nearer to his loved one, and we may imagine the father's joy when his servants, coming to meet him, greeted him with the same words, '*Ho huios sou ze*,' 'thy son liveth.'

'When did he begin to get better?' he asks.

'An hour after mid-day,' they answer.

'The very time when Jesus said to me, "Thy son liveth."' And himself believed and his whole house.

A miracle? Yes, but St. John calls it by a better name, a sign. If it were a miracle it would be over and done with as far as we are concerned. Miracles, we say, do not happen to-day. But if it were a sign, a sign for us as well as for the nobleman—A sign of what? A sign of what God's love can do when coupled with faithful obedience to His orders.

Our Lord was always bidding people consider. 'Consider the lilies. . . . Behold the birds of heaven.' He meant people to use the senses God has given them, for the purposes for which God has given them. And it is because men have obeyed this command 'Consider'—think, that discoveries have been made which in the old days would have been called miraculous.

In these days we are constantly seeing soldiers from convalescent camps walking about a week or two after they have been wounded. In the last war these men would still be in bed in hospital. But to-day, thanks to a wonderful cure known as Penicillin, their wounds are now healed in an incredibly short time. This new wonder of science, like so many others, was a simple discovery of a man who had trained himself to 'consider.' It came about because a window in a laboratory had

been left open. The fresh air caused a blood-culture to go mouldy, and when this culture was 'considered' under a microscope it was found that all the harmful bacilli had died, they could not live in that decaying substance. It was injected into a wounded soldier, and very quickly 'the fever left him' and his wound healed.

A miracle? If you like, but a miracle of God's love coupled with man's obedience to God's command. 'Consider . . . believe . . . obey.'

Tight Corners.

By the Reverend D. T. Davies, M.A., B.D., Forest Hill, London.

'And when the wine failed, the mother of Jesus saith unto him, They have no wine.'—Jn 2^3 (R.V.).

Do you remember the thrill we all had not long ago when news came of one of the great inventions of the war!

A ship had been wrecked, and the Chief Engineer found himself in the life-boat with twenty-seven men. There was but little hope of saving their lives. It was a tight corner. Then an idea came to the engineer's mind. He took an empty petrol tank into which he poured some sea water. Underneath this he made a fire in an old biscuit tin with the fragments of a spare oar for fuel. Around this crazy device he built a rough metal shield to serve as a screen from the wind.

How those shipwrecked men looked on with eager eyes as they watched in silence! Slowly at first in droplets the pure water began to come, then a thin stream, until at the end of the first day a gallon was made. On the second day came two gallons, from which they were able to make soup from their pemmican ration. The corner had been turned because the engineer had invented a 'still' whereby the salt sea water could be turned into fresh water to the saving of the lives of his men. On reaching port the secret was passed on to the big people in charge of our shipping and, after being improved upon, it is now a rule that every ship sailing from a British port must take this life-saving artifice on board.

This reminds us of that greater wonder of which we read in the life of Jesus Christ. He was at a wedding in Cana of Galilee; in the party that followed the ceremony a very awkward thing happened—the supply of wine gave out. It was a tight corner. The invited guests sitting at the table, and yet not enough wine to go round! Why, the young wedded couple in that gossipy little village would never hear the last of it. But they were spared all this, because Jesus came to the rescue. He turned the water into wine.

You girls and boys know already of some awkward moments that come to all of us, tight corners that have to be turned. One of these is called 'Temptation'—This is a corner in which it seems so much easier to tell a lie as the way out of a scrape than to face it bravely. In our resolve to meet it thus, Jesus stands by us to help us turn the temptation into a triumph.

Here is a true story from China. In the city of Chaotung Fu dwelt two young English missionaries, named Frank Dymond and Samuel Pollard. They were the only Europeans for miles around and there was no doctor within two months' journey. One day, Dymond fell ill with fever and his friend had to nurse him. The patient grew weaker and weaker until it seemed plain that the end had come. Then Frank said, 'Do you think Sam, we can have the Sacrament together once more before I leave you alone?' His friend readily acceded and they spoke of how the love of Christ on the Cross cast out fear, even the fear of death. Then, to use their own words, 'in our hearts there was begotten a great loyalty to King Jesus.' From that moment the fever left the sick man and he was gradually restored to health. It was a tight corner but Jesus came to that little supper room and turned their weakness into gladness and strength.

In the tight corners of life, the secret of victory is to invite Jesus Christ as guest into our hearts, when He will share with us His strength and make us more than conquerors.

The Christian Year.

Second Sunday after Easter.

The Discipline of Suffering.

By the Reverend Principal H. F. Lovell Cocks, M.A., D.D., Bristol.

'But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the exceeding greatness of the power may be of God, and not from ourselves; we are pressed on every side, yet not straitened; perplexed, yet not unto despair; pursued, yet not forsaken; smitten down, yet not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body.'—2 Co 4^{7-10} (R.V.).

The Apostle Paul was one of the strongest men in history; yet how far his strength was from the self-confidence and conscious mastery of the natural man our text bears witness. In this epistle, his *weakness* is the theme to which Paul returns again and again. From the time of his first appearance in Corinth, when he came 'in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling,' his enemies and detractors had done their best to give him a lively sense of inferiority. For many in the Corinthian Church his apostolic commission was suspect, and his message an unphilosophic crudity. Some volatile believers greatly preferred the golden tongued Apollos and took no pains to hide their preference. It is not surprising that Paul was acutely conscious of his weakness when so many candid souls were continually reminding him of it. Yet his references to it do not spring from that mood of reckless self-depreciation which is usually a perverted conceit; nor are they expressions of a mock or ironical humility. They are frank admissions of a fact. But look at them again. Paul not only admits his weakness, but glories in it: 'If I must needs glory, I will glory of the things that concern my weakness. . . . I take pleasure in weaknesses, in injuries, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong.' Now the Apostle

was neither fool nor madman, and morbid psychology will throw no light on this strange glorying. If Paul rejoiced in weakness, distress, and persecution, it was not for the sake of these things, which he hated and tried to avoid, as we all do, but, as he says, *for Christ's sake*. He welcomed them and gloried in them as tokens of the truth of his gospel and the genuineness of his apostleship. It is as though he said to his critics 'I thank you for reminding me of my frailty. For if I, being the weakling you know me to be, am yet able to do and to bear all things in the service of the gospel, then God has been pleased to confirm my preaching by a miracle. By this sign I know that my gospel is true and that my apostleship is valid, that it is indeed the will of God to choose the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty. Of myself I can do nothing. If I live and labour and suffer, it is not I but Christ who lives and works in me. This is the divine strategy of redemption, that we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the exceeding greatness of the power may be of God and not from ourselves.'

But let us look still more closely at this apostolic weakness. Paul is referring neither to the sense of being subdued by a sudden influx of divine power, nor to the ecstatic experience of being rapt out of the body into the seventh heaven, nor even to the sense of utter dependence upon God, although he had known them all. There is an unmistakable *pattern* to be traced in his weakness. Listen to him: 'He was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth through the power of God.' And again: '. . . that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, becoming conformed unto his death; if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead.' And again: 'God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.' And here in our text: 'Always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body.' You recognize the pattern? In his weakness Paul 'puts on' Christ, is conformed to His death and lives in the power of His resurrection. His weakness is the almighty impotence of faith.

Elsewhere in the New Testament this pattern of Christian weakness, this sharing of Christ's sufferings, is interpreted in terms of the 'fiery trial' and the 'resisting unto blood'—the lot of the faithful in all ages of persecution. In an evil world, the believer's obedience to his Master brings suffering in its train, and in his ordeal he is upheld by the fellowship of the crucified Christ. Paul also interprets his sufferings in this way; they are honours conferred by the King, a sacrament of communion with the Redeemer. But he goes even deeper in his understanding of their significance. He knows that the sufferings of Christ are not primarily external states; knows, too, that we may suffer in our bodies what Christ suffered and still be far from Him. ('Though I give my body to be burned and have not love, it profiteth me nothing.') The Christian is crucified to the world before he is crucified by it; for faith itself, Paul says, is a crucifixion and a resurrection. His own crucifixion began on the Damascus road. It was there that he threw away strength and embraced weakness. It was there that he turned his back on a brilliant career to become an obscure preacher of the gospel, and renounced power and position to be one of Christ's nobodies. To the friends of his youth this was midsummer madness—weakness indeed, and final ruin. But to Paul it meant forgiveness and peace of mind and new life from the dead. 'I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may gain Christ, and be found in him.' *That I may gain Christ*—he has learned the secret of faith, whose power to move mountains never resides in itself, in the strength of its affirmations or the intensity of its experiences, but in the divine Word it confesses, the Christ it proclaims.

It is easy to see why the believer's faith *appears* weak to the outsider. To have faith, Paul tells us, is to have the mind of Christ—to share His thoughts and compassions, to judge as He judges, to prize what He prizes and to hate what He hates. But to share this divine wisdom is to appear foolish in the eyes of the world. We are reminded of what Socrates says in Plato's *Republic*—that worldly men are more likely to regard the true philosophers as star-gazers and boobies than as men whose wisdom fits them for the management of the State. The world is always telling us that organized religion is dead or dying, that the Christian gospel is too visionary to have any relevance to this world of blood and iron. Yet we know that the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and that in the massive realism of the gospel of grace the evil and folly of man are taken into the reckoning, grappled with, and overcome.

But—remember—our faith not only appears weak, it *is* weak. We know what the gospel is. We believe the gospel—and yet we do not believe. Luther puts his finger on the spot: 'These things, as touching the words, we know well enough, and can talk of them. But in practice, and in the conflict when the Devil goeth about to deface Christ, and to pluck the word of grace out of our hearts, we find we do not yet know them well and as we should do. The article of justification by faith alone is, in respect of us, very brittle, for we are brittle.'

Yes, we are brittle—earthen vessels. Let our weakness remind us that it was never the strength of our own faith that gave us our footing in the gospel, but the might of God's lovingkindness. Weak we are, and to the end of our earthly pilgrimage weak we remain. We are not promised an easy victory. 'We are pressed on every side, yet not straitened; perplexed, yet not unto despair; pursued, yet not forsaken; smitten down, yet not destroyed.' We win by the narrowest of margins; but we win. For the promise stands: 'My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness.'

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Through a Glass, Darkly.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN R. GRAY, B.D., CHAPLAIN, R.N.

'For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known. And now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love.'—1 Co $13^{12.13}$.

Up till six hundred years ago mirrors as we know them of silvered glass were unknown. The only aids to beauty or to humility that existed in our Lord's day were pieces of burnished metal which gave back a very imperfect image.

Paul here says that, as we look at life and ponder its problems, it is like looking in a bad mirror darkly, or as the Greek suggests looking in a bad mirror and seeing a puzzle. Plato had pretty much the same idea. He said that in life we never came in touch with the ultimately real. We lived in our cave of life, and all we saw of the real world of the open air and sunlight were the shadows of those who passed the entrance. Bunyan in *The Pilgrim's Progress* hinted at the same thing. His Christian fled from the city of destruction and sought the road of life. Meeting Evangelist, Christian asked the way to the Celestial City. There, said Evangelist, through that Wicket-gate. But for Christian no easy gate lay open. 'I see no gate,' said he. 'Ah, well,' said Evangelist, 'see you yon clear bright shining light.' Christian peered through the gloom that surrounded him and said at last 'I think I do.' 'Keep your eyes on the light and make for it,' said Evangelist, 'and all will be well.' Now we see through a glass, darkly.

Where Plato, Paul, and Bunyan agree few would care to differ; but at any rate which of us who has lived for any length of time in such a world as ours or who has thought seriously or felt deeply about life does not know that they are right. We none of us know all the answers, least of all we preachers, who are at best only more aware of the questions. Life's profoundest experiences and deepest problems are shrouded in a mystery which the acutest mind cannot penetrate nor the most sensitive spirit dissolve. That, too, is how Job felt as he reflected about his own life. His conclusion was: 'Where shall wisdom be found or where is the place of understanding. Man knoweth not the price thereof neither is it found in the land of the living.' Job had suffered unimaginable things. His too-wise friends produced various easy explanations of his miseries—principally that somewhere, somehow, he must have sinned to bring such miseries upon himself. Job easily refuted them by pointing to the prosperity of the admittedly wicked. Brushing them aside he returned to his problem: 'Why? why? why has God permitted these things to happen to me?' He beat as it were against the fast shut door of the secret of life till his knuckles bled. Out of his anguish there emerged two convictions.

First, that there is an answer to life. There must be. To believe otherwise is to court madness and despair. And, second, that the answer is too deep for any but God to know, that it lies beyond the periphery of man's sight, beyond the range of his understanding. Nowhere in the whole range of human literature, learning, or philosophy has a man come nearer to the truth than this—that there is an explanation and that that explanation lies outwith the sphere of man's theorising. It has seemed good to God to leave man with his most important questions unanswered. Certainly any cheap and easy explanation of life just won't fit the facts. To tell someone who has lost his sight or someone who is dying of cancer, or to tell a mother who has lost her son that it is all only a matter of evolution or education or economics or something of the sort is simply to mock. The solution of such questions, if there is a solution, must be one that recognizes the dignity of such suffering, a solution that itself involves suffering and pain and that finally leaves some mystery unresolved. The world's anguish and its poetry, its longing and its tenderness cannot be the result merely of failing to understand. Here we see through a glass, darkly.

Ah, but Paul knew more than Job. He knew Christ crucified. The Cross of Christ is not a theory about life, but it is an answer to its deepest problems. It does not explain why life's wounds are inflicted but it can heal them. It is not a philosophical statement. It is a fact of experience—a fact grim and tragic and yet a fact of glory and wonder. It does not tell us all truth but only that here in Christ is the direction in which truth lies. At the foot of the Cross we are not told something about life which we can write in a book. We are given a way of life and enough of light to live it. It does not tell us why there is pain and suffering, sin and remorse, death and despair in life. But it stills our rebellion, for there we see that God is in it, fighting, struggling, suffering with us. We see through a glass, darkly, but when we see most clearly and look most deeply into life, what we see mirrored there is a Cross, a Cross on which the Son of God is hanging. And if we walk in the light from that Cross we shall fear no evil even in the deepest shadow of life's valley.

But the Cross is not the end. There came the Resurrection—that broken body raised in power; the Resurrection which out of death brings life, out of tragedy brings triumph. Without the Resurrection—had all we know of Christ ended on the Cross—our tragic sense of life's futility would have been heightened, not relieved, by His suffering. It would have but confirmed our black despair. But if Christ be indeed risen from the dead then our faith is not vain. For if there be life beyond the grave, there is hope and knowledge far greater than this world can yield. Here we see through a glass, darkly, but there face to face. There we shall learn—learn all we lacked before, hear, know, and say what this tumultuous body now denies. And feel, who have laid our groping hands away. And see, no longer blinded by our eyes.

Here we know in part. There shall we know

even as also we are known, know ourselves the greatest enigma we most of us face, know those mysterious beings we call our friends, know God as now He alone knows us.

And what then is the conclusion of the whole matter. Job sums it up: 'The fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding.' But to Paul the teaching of the Cross and the Resurrection and of the Life that led up to them is summed up in three words: faith, hope, and love. Since the Saviour died and rose again we must walk in faith, trusting a love so great and boundless, even where we cannot see. We must walk in hope, looking for the best that is yet to be, for the good things prepared of the Father that pass our present understanding. Above all we must walk in love for whatever may be the final answer that awaits us on the other side, love here and now cannot be wrong.

Love is the answer to our seeking. Love is the end of all our questing. Love is the essence and the meaning of life, and if we allow life with its puzzles and its difficulties, its sorrows and its heartbreak, to be touched by the Cross of Christ, these things will issue from us in love, in love for God who so loved us, and in love of our fellows who share the burden of our mortality and share the wide pity of our Saviour. As he died, the great Wagner cried, 'Wisdom through compassion.' And if we follow our Lord to the Cross He will share with us His wisdom that came from compassion, from love and pity for all the sons and daughters of men.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Thoughts by the Well.

BY THE REVEREND A. A. MACKENZIE, B.A., B.D., BIRREGURRA, VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA.

'The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him.'—Jn 4^{23}.

One of our Army Chaplains, recently returned, tells of a moving experience he had in Palestine. That hallowed land impressed him in many subtle ways. To walk the streets of Jerusalem and the roads of Galilee, recalling that here the Saviour of the world walked and talked with men was in itself moving. But to stand by the Well of Jacob in Sychar, the one authentic spot associated with the ministry of our Lord, was the most moving experience of all, one which brought a hush to the spirit. As there the Chaplain stood wondering an Arab woman came to the well, drew her bucket of water and, turning, offered him a drink. 'To drink that water,' he says, 'was a deeply moving experience, one that I shall never forget.'

In his story the Chaplain goes on to tell of the thoughts that came to him as he stood by that well, famous in the history of Israel. But what, think you, were the thoughts of our Lord as He sat by that same well? We are not told. But the story in St. John's Gospel is not without some suggestions. As the Chaplain's thoughts went back to that hot summer's day in the ministry of our Lord, did not Jesus' own thoughts go back to an earlier stage in the history of His people? What more natural than that such a place should inspire a host of historical reflections? This is Jacob's Well. Here it is in the territory of the Samaritans, territory that no Jew will enter if he can avoid it. And here am I, a Jew. This well was gifted by the common progenitor of Jew and Samaritan to his children. To-day, while here I sit, Jew and Samaritan have no dealings with one another. They will not even speak. Children of the one father, they live in bitter enmity; not as brethren. Over the years political and social differences have driven them apart. Even their religion has served to bring about the same unhappy result. Though they worship the one God, the God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob, they worship apart. Each has his own temple and his own sacrifices. Each has his own holy hill, which, so he says, is 'the place where men ought to worship.' In that which should bind them together, their worship, they have no fellowship. Nor is it only over worship that they have quarrelled: they have quarrelled over the Scriptures, through which God speaks to men. The Samaritans have Moses (the first five books of our Old Testament), but the Prophets they reject.

As there Jesus sat by the well, did He not think such thoughts as these? And was not His great heart filled with sorrow at the folly of men, and with longing to give them that which would satisfy their thirsty souls? As Campbell Morgan puts it, 'His appeal to the woman for water was based on their common humanity. His offer of living water to her was a revelation of God's attitude toward those outside the boundaries of the chosen people.'

If to-day our Lord were to sit in some meeting place of men in London or Berlin would His thoughts be so very different from those by the well? In some respects the position of the English and the German peoples to-day is like that of the Jew and the Samaritan in the time of our Lord. They are racially akin, linguistically akin, and till 1918 dynastically akin. They are children of the same progenitor, yet living in enmity. Is the passage of the years, with its diverging social and political developments, to drive and keep them apart? Is it to make them ultimately irreconcilable? We who believe in the gospel can never accept that as inevitable.

During the past decade the German people have travelled far in their divergence from the Faith of their fathers. They have forsaken the gospel and embraced a pagan way of life. It was not always so. Whatever may be the state of religion in the German Army of to-day, during the last war our airmen saw Services of Holy Communion being held behind the German lines. In the opposing armies men gathered round the Table of the one Lord and worshipped the one God. Inscribed upon the old Imperial Flag of Germany was the legend '*Gott Mit Uns*,' while we on our part thought of our fighting in terms of 'God, King, and Empire.' Children of the one God and Father, we were at war. That which should have bound us together was being used to keep us apart.

Nor are things any better in times of peace. On the ruins of war trade relations are restored, but religious exclusiveness persists. Those of us who have lived among the children of German exiles in our own rural districts know what splendid settlers our Lutheran brethren make. But we know too that in matters of religion, of Christian worship and work, there is no fellowship. On certain occasions, such as the visit of a deputation from the Bible Society, the Protestant churches will unite. But the Lutheran stands aloof. Lutheran pastors have been known to say that they could take part in a Bible Society meeting only on condition that there was no prayer. Not even in the Lord's Prayer would they join with us.

But such exclusiveness is not limited to German Lutherans. We find it among ourselves. Our National Shrine of Remembrance on St. Kilda Road is a noble monument to those Australians who gave their lives in the First World War. But in no part of that shrine is any symbol of the Christian Faith to be found. True, certain words of our Lord are inscribed in the Rock of Remembrance. But they are truncated and emptied of all Christian content, and the name of Him who uttered them may not be mentioned in praise or prayer. That such religious exclusiveness should continue to mar our one truly national day and service is a grief to many and a shame to all.

Again like Jew and Samaritan, we quarrel over the Scriptures. All alike claim to find the foundation of their faith and worship in the Bible, yet the sharpest and deepest cleavage is over the interpretation of the Word. Only a few years ago, when in our own Assembly a Professor of the New Testament was to be appointed, it was said that the first and most important question to be asked of every candidate was this : ' How does he read and interpret the Bible ? ' Certainly such a question should be asked. It is inconceivable that it should not. The teaching of a theological professor is vital. But it does not justify the breach of fellowship, the persecuting spirit, and the uncharitable language, that too frequently mar the relations between Christian brethren.

Here, then, are the three particularisms to which, as Professor Wright has shown, all religion is prone—the particularism of *place*, the particularism of *race*, and the particularism of *book*. To these three we may, perhaps, add a fourth—that of *form*. That differing views of the Sacraments and of Ordination should bring Christian brethren to unchurch one another is surely not according to the mind of the Master. ' When men know God as the Divine Father they do not separate, and fight on a question of the *place* where He ought to be worshipped.' Nor on any other question. In the worship of the one Father all particularisms are transcended. ' The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth : for the Father seeketh such to worship him.' God is not only the Father of all men : He is the ' seeking Father.' The woman of Samaria was amazed that the Stranger, obviously a Jew, should ask her for a drink. That was not the habit of her people, nor of His. Jews and Samaritans did not speak, much less ask a service of one another. In this, however, both acted upon wrong thoughts of God. Jesus, on the other hand, acted upon right thoughts. Contrary to custom, He had entered the despised province. ' He must needs go through Samaria,' for in Samaria were those He, in whom the Father was revealed, had ' come to seek and to save.' Had the woman known His identity and seen in Him the ' Seeking Father,' she would have ' asked of Him.' For with God are no particularisms—He loveth all and hateth none, He seeketh all that they may know and serve Him. Not in the particularisms of men, but in the universalism of Christ lies the hope of this divided and devastated world.

Our Friend, our Brother, and our Lord,
What may Thy service be ?—
Nor name, nor form, nor ritual word,
But simply following Thee.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Moving.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN B. NETTLESHIP, B.A., B.D., CARLISLE.

' The Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house.'—Gn 12^{1}.

A few days ago I was speaking to a friend whose anxious face and furrowed brow suggested that he was engaged in one of the most desperate, important, and exacting undertakings of his life. ' This job,' he complained, ' is taking years off my life ! ' I happened to know what ' this job ' to which he referred, was. He was moving from one house to another !

Now amid world-shaking events, a mere change of abode may seem to be a trivial occurrence, yet most of us who have had any experience will be only too ready to sympathize with my friend, and to admit that we share his reluctance to move. We become so accustomed to our surroundings—we men, especially—that even a re-arrangement of the furniture, to which all housewives are addicted from time to time, seems like a major revolution ! The root of the matter is that we don't like to be disturbed. We resent anything that is a departure from our regular routine. It is often said that an Englishman's home is his castle, and few of us would want to insist that there is no room in life for the home as a refuge, to which a man can withdraw now and then from life's bitter struggles, for refreshment and rest. Thank God for the refuge of our homes !

At the same time, we must see this thing in its proper perspective. If our love of ease, our reluctance to bestir ourselves, are allowed to dominate our lives until we come to the point that we are unwilling to contemplate anything that is likely to interrupt the even tenor of our way, then we can be pretty sure that we have lost all sensitiveness to God's will and purposes for us. For if there is one thing certain in the Bible, it is that

God is continually disturbing the lives of those who are responsive to His call.

What was it that moved Abraham to leave the settled life to which he had been accustomed and set out upon the hazardous journey toward a vague destination? Was it just that he was 'fed up' with the tameness of the settled existence, and that he longed for a more adventurous life? There is nothing in the Biblical account to suggest that. What we are told is that the call of God came to him to move on! And though it meant the complete dislocation of all his ways of life, without demur or question he obeyed the summons. The upheaval in his settled life was not the result of some impulse or foible of his own. It was God, the Great Disturber, coming into Abraham's uneventful life, and turning things upside down. It is tantamount to saying, 'This is no place for you, Abraham; I've bigger things for you to do—not so easy, not so pleasant; but you must go!'

Isn't that what the Voice of God is saying over and over again in the Bible? 'Go!' That is the word which came to Moses as he tended the flock of Jethro; it is the word that came to Jeremiah as he struggled to excuse himself from the divine commission on account of his youth; it is the word which came to Amos as he followed his occupation as a herdsman; it is the word that came to Simon and Andrew as they cast their nets into the sea; it is the word that came to Paul on the road to Damascus. 'Go!' For each of these men God has a new task, a new sphere of labour. Before the summons came not one of them could have imagined himself in the position to which God called him. 'Me to go to Pharaoh?' Moses would exclaim, in consternation. 'Me a prophet!', both Amos and Jeremiah would cry incredulously. 'Me a Christian? Never!' would be Paul's contemptuous assertion.

Yet to each of these men came the divine summons, upsetting all their plans, driving them out of one sphere of life into another, and causing them to adapt themselves to a completely new set of circumstances. Nor is this an experience which is confined to the pages of the Bible. I believe that wherever men listen for the voice of God and, hearing it, obey, there is bound to be in their lives conflict and upheaval. There will be new experiences to embrace, and old ones to forgo; fresh truths to be assimilated and outworn beliefs to be cast aside. Life is movement. We cannot remain where we are. As the writer to the Hebrews asserts, 'We have not here an abiding city.' Spiritually, we are nomads, without settled habitation, driven from one place to another by the disturbing necessities of life; yet, for us, as for the children of Israel in the wilderness, there is an aim behind all the seemingly haphazard wanderings. As they were forced from one place to another—here by shortage of food or water, there by the pressure of some hostile tribe—it must often have seemed to them that life was a restless, cruel, and meaningless sort of thing; yet wasn't it in fact the very restlessness and uncertainty of life that disciplined them and brought them ever nearer to their goal?

God can very often only work through your life and mine by shaking us up and moving us on. If we are ever to approach the goal which lies before us, then, like Abraham, we must be prepared for a life which is changing and challenging. We must be ready for the divine summons which may break in upon us quite suddenly while we are busy with our money-making, or with plans for our comfort and security, or with some quite harmless pleasure. Are we prepared at a moment's notice to throw up all this in obedience to a divine urge? That, after all, is the test of our loyalty and our faith.

Let us look at this for a moment in more tangible form. One of the ways in which the divine urge to 'Move on!' comes to us is in the realm of thought. How reluctant men are to use their brains in the realm of religion! The very word 'theology' upsets a lot of people. 'That,' they retort, 'is all very well for the College classroom, but we don't want it in the pulpit.' Yet, let us never forget that our Lord exhorted us to love the Lord our God, not only with all our heart, and all our soul, and all our strength, but also with all our mind. Jesus always welcomed any indication that either His own disciples or the crowds to whom He preached wanted to know more. When the disciples asked Him to explain the Parable of the Sower to them, He did not waive them aside impatiently as dull or stupid. Eagerly He sought to satisfy their desire for understanding.

Now if we use our minds energetically in the sphere of our religion, we shall from time to time encounter startling truths which, if accepted, may revolutionize our thinking and conduct. Very often in these cases by far the easiest and pleasantest thing to do would be to ignore the implications of our new discovery. The temptation is to stay where we are and hold on to our old ideas, comforting ourselves with the thought that 'if they were good enough for my father, they are good enough for me.' But surely the heart of the matter lies in the words of Pastor Robinson to the Pilgrim Fathers, 'The Lord has still more light and truth to break forth from His Holy Word.'

Let us never be afraid that the increase of knowledge will destroy the essence of our faith. That fear apparently *has* assailed religious people from time to time, and has caused them to refuse to recognize certain scientific facts because they appear to conflict with long-held religious truths. But however much new knowledge may require the forms of our faith to be modified, it can never damage or weaken the heart of the Christian faith, for it is rooted and grounded in God, who is from everlasting to everlasting.

> Let knowledge grow from more to more,
> But more of reverence in us dwell;
> That mind and soul, according well,
> May make one music as before,
> But vaster.

When the voice of God summons us to venture out into new realms of truth, let us answer the

call in the faith and spirit in which Abraham went forth.

What is true in the realm of the mind is true also in the realm of the spirit. It is not only our thought which must develop, but also our experience. For far too many people religious experience is a stationary thing. It may be summed up in terms of something which happened to them years ago; perhaps some sermon they heard in their youth, which made a profound impression upon them at the time. But the tragedy is that that is the sum total of their religious experience. It has not grown as they themselves have grown. Their minds have become more mature with the passing of the years; their experience of life has deepened, but their religion is still the religion of their youth —the religion of a particular mood. Such people are very much like the women who came to the tomb of Jesus and found it empty. Entering the tomb, they saw 'a young man . . . arrayed in a white robe.' He said to them, 'Ye seek Jesus . . . he is not here . . . he is risen. . . . But go tell his disciples and Peter, he goeth before you into Galilee.'

Jesus is always going ahead of men, in order that they shall follow. But many do not follow. Their religious experience does not grow as they grow, and therefore when they repeat the old prayers that were once so real, and brought them so close to the feet of God, they find now that they seem to be mere words. They expect to find Christ, and lo! He has gone before them!

O how we need the adventurous spirit which in thought and experience and life is willing to launch out in faith in response to the challenge of God.

We started with the thought of a man removing from one home to another. Is not the main problem there what to take with one and what to leave behind? One has to decide what is precious and necessary, and to have the courage to turn out anything that is just rubbish. We need precisely the same foresight and courage in the life of the mind and the spirit. We need the discriminating mind. There are times when we shall need the courage to break away from old beliefs and old traditions, and to go bravely forward into new realms of thought and experience. It will disturb us and shake us, but the Christian spirit is essentially progressive, leaving behind the things which hinder and hamper, and reaching out to new truth. This does not mean a new religion, for Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever; but it does mean seeking earnestly at every turn Christ's will here and now. Because Christian people did a certain thing or said a certain thing a hundred years ago, it does not necessarily mean that it is the right thing for us now.

To those who answer God's call He gives His Spirit to-day as He gave it to Abraham long ago.

> Neath Thy renewing fire we glow,
> And still from strength to strength we go,
> From height to height we climb.
> Darkness and dread we leave behind,
> New light, new glory, still we find.
> New realms divine possess.

With Saint Luke in Jerusalem from Easter Day till Pentecost.

By the Reverend Eric F. F. Bishop, Newman School of Missions, Thabor, Jerusalem.

'When the day of Pentecost was *fully come*.'[1] There would seem to be a tiny point of Lukan accuracy in this time-allusion, the natural implication being that it was practically at the close of the Feast of Weeks, or Pentecost, that the shared experience of the first Christians took place and shape. It would seem that there is reason for thinking that the whole period from the Resurrection Day to 'Whitsun-day' was known as Pentecost, not only the day of climax. What St. Luke was *getting at* here was the 'completion of the period.' The Greek Orthodox Church still observes the day of 'Half-Pentecost'—as the Arab Christians call it نصّ الخمسين—in the middle of the period—a phrase which is at least an interesting commentary on the Lukan συμπληροῦσθαι, to indicate the end. When St. Luke accompanied St. Paul for the Pentecost of A.D. 57, he would have lived with the others through the experiences of the first Whitsun-day, quarter of a century or more before, and learned how they had lived on the tip-toe of expectation till the great day was 'fully come.' Further, St. Luke would have had ample time to collect and assimilate other interesting details covering the history of the never-to-be-forgotten Pentecostal period, using the term in the wider sense. How could he have done otherwise with those few precious days in close fellowship with 'eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word'?[2] It may be worth while gathering up some of the details that held his memory in con-

[1] Ac 2^1.

[2] Lk 1^2.

versation, his imagination as he wended his pilgrim way, and his heart in all he saw and heard and thought. The material as a whole may be somewhat sketchy, but it is not bereft of Palestinian background one way or another, especially if we are prepared to admit either an Aramaic source-document for the end of the Gospel and the opening chapters of the Acts,[1] or the probable enterprise of St. Luke in being such a good 'medical missionary' that he did not omit to learn enough Aramaic so as to be able adequately to deal with his sources, whether oral or written!

If we take these little 'pen pictures' of Palestine as they come in the Lukan Resurrection-Pentecost narrative, and start with the aftermath of the Crucifixion tragedy, we are rewarded with two touches of feminine memory, for the Galilean women were careful to state that though they got ready their 'spices and ointments'—(there is surely no call to think that they had to go and buy these on the 'Friday' afternoon)—they observed the full requirements of the law in keeping the Sabbath as their day of rest.[2] It was their last Sabbath as Jewesses; the next saw them members of the first Hebrew-Christian community. They may still have kept Sabbath, but not in the old spirit. St. Luke may have recorded the detail as showing how the women thought that all was over; but it incidentally reveals the custom of Palestinian Jewry at the time—maintained still in many of the stricter homes.

Next morning they went off together early to the tomb believing the worst until they found 'the stone (unmentioned so far in Luke) rolled away.'[3] Does not this mean that they saw it in the place where it was rolled, not the gaping orifice where it had been? It is their story that Luke is telling; and their next reference to the 'body of the *Lord* Jesus' would likewise bespeak their 'Oratio Recta.' The word may not even have had the theological significance of κύριος, even when Luke had the conversation in Jerusalem, but no one in Palestine would dream of speaking of a prophet or other great man, alive or dead, without an honorific title. Custom here will have its way. In modern Arabic it would be السّيّد rather than الرّبّ. But the most valuable Palestinian touch is still to come, when the women, in relating their experiences with the two men who accosted them, told St. Luke both of their inner feelings of considerable apprehension and alarm, and then of their instinctive prostration of themselves with their heads to the ground.[4] While they may have been 'awed by the supernatural portent,'[5] they took refuge in a custom that went back to the patriarchs, was indulged in by Ruth and Abigail in different circumstances and even by the King of Israel in the presence of another 'supernatural portent.'[6] But the custom still is prevalent. There can hardly be a missionary who one time or another has not experienced something of this kind, meant in all good faith, and has not shared the reaction of St. Peter in Cæsarea with Cornelius.[7] We are not far from the land where all these things happened when we gratefully acknowledge that St. Luke has caught an immemorial touch of local colour at its truest, when in the presence of something tremendous they did not yet understand, the women 'bowed their faces to the earth.' 'Matthew' records something very similar in the meeting of the women with Jesus—only in rather more devotional language.[8] In 'Luke' at all events the story is the women's own; we can put it back into the first person plural, even up to the way in which their version of the good news has been treated by the apostles; in St. Luke they had a listener who perhaps hailed from a place where women had more chance of being believed and were treated with the respect first-hand witness deserved.

There are some hints, too, of local feeling and tradition in the Emmaus story that need attention, and remind us in detail of the more unsophisticated Palestine that still is—and we trust may yet remain.[9] In 24^{17} is there not a fair amount to be said for the A.V. rendering of the closing phrase—'and are downcast'? The R.V. does not even give this as a marginal possibility, while the text has 'and they stood downcast,' as if in answer to the Lord's question. But can this be? It is surely more in keeping with the story that our Lord could not help noticing the demeanour of the pair. Any stranger would be glad of some way of introducing himself. 'Why do you look so woe-begone?' 'Inquisitiveness' in the East, too, has more generous promptings, while a single traveller would be only too glad to find fellowship in the way. And would not their reaction to the query be rather one of surprise than 'downcastness'? 'Are you the only visitor in Jerusalem who doesn't know what has been happening?' It was somewhat brusque, without being rude; and probably both parties were glad the ice had been so nicely broken; they could talk about it all to their heart's content. The Arabic versions certainly bear out the interpretation of the A.V. The pair had looked σκυθρωποί for many a sad hour. Semitic-like they had taken the negative side—in this case—and held it tight. The whole

[1] With Professor Burkitt and Dr. Torrey.
[2] Lk 23^{56}. [3] Lk $24^{2.3}$. [4] Lk 24^{5}.
[5] H. Burton, *The Gospel of St. Luke*, 473.
[6] Ru 2^{10}, 1 S 25^{23} 28^{14}.
[7] Ac $10^{25.26}$. [8] Mt 28^{9}. [9] Lk $24^{13ff.}$.

thing was finished. They had refused the verdict of the women, even though based on a 'vision of angels,' who say, 'Oratio Recta' again, 'that he is alive.' What was to be gained then by staying on in Jerusalem? They might just as well complete the feast at home in Emmaus. The story is redolent of that Semitic attitude to an appraisal of the situation, which will not be gainsaid, till it is possible to switch right over to the other side. There was no withholding of judgment. The A.V. must be reinstated in deference to its interpretation being true to psychology in Palestine, as it is and was.

Then there is a delightful Palestinian trait both in the Risen Christ and the two companions, already determined to be His would-be hosts, but having to wait for the opportune moment to insist that their fellow-traveller must spend the night with them.[1] Luke must have had this experience himself and what missionary, medical or otherwise, has not had the same? [2] And Jesus did the right thing too. 'He made as though he would have gone further.' 'They constrained him, saying, Abide with us.' Our Lord was *au fait* with the custom of His country; there could be no possible acceptance of the invitation 'first go off.' There was Palestinian courtesy in the Risen Master and in those who wished to have Him for the night. If the walk took place close by the route followed by the present main road to Jaffa, there is at least one obvious spot for the pressing invitation. The road junction near the Monastery of Latrun presents itself as most suitable, with a road southwards to Gaza, another straight on to Lydda and Joppa, with one to the right leading up into the Bethoron passes and Emmaus just a mile away along it. It was natural for the little group to stop at this place where four ways met; it was natural for both parties to act in the way they did; though we may add that all the time Jesus wanted to be invited to stay—that was why He had caught them up on the homeward road! [3]

'And he went in to abide with them.' Gathered round the village 'table' for the evening meal 'He took a loaf, gave thanks, broke and was handing it to them.' [4] It is probably unwise to see in this verse any reference to the Eucharist as such; but this does not preclude the conclusion that Jesus had a characteristic way of breaking a loaf at any meal. This pair had—so far as our evidence goes—not been at the Last Supper; but they would still be eating unleavened bread, as it was in the Passover octave. If this Cleopas was our Lord's maternal uncle, he would presumably often have had opportunity of sharing meals with Jesus. In any case this is again something Palestinian rather than theological; and with it should be coupled the fact that it was such a compliment to them that an obviously honourable guest should take the lead; and Palestine still places honoured guests at the head of the table. It all reads very natural.

Up till that moment they had not recognized their guest—perhaps it was the same sort of experience that Mary Magdalene had had earlier that morning.[5] It was what He said and how He said it that convinced her; it was what He did and how He did it, that convinced the pair. It was all over in but a few minutes; and 'He vanished from them.' He left their home in the same invisible manner in which He was to meet them again in the 'upper room.'

So back to Jerusalem they went; rising up the 'same hour' surely means without wasting a precious moment; the phrase is thoroughly Semitic.[6] But we cannot leave them yet, for they must have been present all through the next scene, without presumably sharing in the consternation. We do not know for certain who it was that was at the back of Luke's story at this stage—perhaps the son of Cleopas (?), perhaps John—but from one of their memories we have the detail of the 'broiled fish,' either cured fish brought from the 'suq' or (as we should like to feel) procured from the agent whom the sons of Zebedee employed in Jerusalem, who stocked the fish from Galilee which they had salted at Taricheae; it would be especially needed at feast times with the extra pilgrim crowds, who might bring some store of bread but not always their προσφάγιον.[7] This then was the Lord's first 'Galilean' experience after He was 'risen from the dead.' Some MSS add that our Lord also partook of honey; this would certainly be in comb form at this period of the year, with Palestine a blaze of flowers.

[1] Lk $24^{28.\ 29}$. [2] Cf. Ac 16^{15}.
[3] Cf. E.T. [4] Lk 24^{30}.
[5] Jn $20^{16ff.}$. [6] Lk 24^{33}.
[7] Jn 26^{57}. The Arabic equivalent إدام is still heard.

(To be continued.)

Contributions and Comments.

New Testament Christianity and Liberalism.

I HAVE read the summary of Dr. T. W. Manson's contribution, 'The Failure of Liberalism to Interpret the Bible as the Word of God,' to the volume on *The Interpretation of the Bible* in the Notes of Recent Exposition in the January issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. In his criticism of 'Liberalism,' and his contention for New Testament Christianity, I am entirely in accord with

him, as far as a judgment can be based on such evidence; but I very much regret that he has allowed those whose failure he is recording to retain the description of *Liberalism*. Liberty is too great an idea to be discredited by such a use. It should not be granted that those who reach positive conclusions on the matters in dispute have not exercised as unhampered a liberty of judgment as those who advocate the negation. Liberation from the rigid and intolerant Presbyterian Calvinism in the later decades of last century was a welcome and yet painful experience for me personally, and that Liberalism did not result in any doubt or denial of New Testament Christianity, but in a reconstruction of theology which I believe to be as positive as Dr. Manson could desire. I have, when necessary, described myself as a liberal evangelical. I have called no man master, but have tried to understand the Bible with such guidance as Dr. W. Robertson Smith, Sir George Adam Smith on the Old Testament, Dr. Marcus Dods and Dr. A. B. Bruce on the New Testament, afforded, and as such scholars as Dr. Manson himself is now with so great distinction providing. I do not suppose for a moment that Dr. Manson would depreciate as 'Liberalism' the presentation of the Old Testament in another of the volumes you summarize, the Rev. Leonard T. Towers, *A Background to the Old Testament*. The wrong step was taken when the Higher Criticism, the literary and historical judgment of the contents of the Bible, was encumbered by two new principles, correlation and comparison in the religious historical method. Here the two assumptions of physical science—causality and uniformity—were applied to the contents of the Bible, although inapplicable without modification, in the recognition of divine providence and human freedom or divine revelation and human inspiration as factors recognizable not by scientific knowledge, but by religious faith. I must add, however, that the antagonism of science to theology was provoked by the dogmatic interpretation of the Bible, as an authoritative text-book of science in opposition to scientific discovery, and that I am in entire agreement with Canon Raven in his contention that the theologian should have some knowledge of one of the physical sciences, and take due account of what such sciences as psychology and sociology can contribute to his doctrine of man along with the Christian estimate of man in his relation to God instead of falling back on antiquated dogmas. To use the word Liberalism as Dr. Manson has done is to encourage the reaction which seems to be the fashion of the hour, and which I am sure does not commend itself to Dr. Manson. Why not use positivism, agnosticism, or naturalism as much more appropriate terms?

A. E. GARVIE.

London.

Entre Nous.

Dr. Barnardo.

It is not too much to say that Thomas John Barnardo, F.R.C.S.(Ed.), was one of the most remarkable personalities of the nineteenth century (he was born in 1845), far exceeding much more famous men in qualities of genius, industry, moral influence, and devotion to a high aim. In the short space of forty years, starting without patronage of any kind, he raised, says his secretary Mr. A. E. Williams, the author of the latest biography—*Barnardo of Stepney* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net), a sum of three and a quarter million pounds, established a network of Homes of various kinds such as had never existed before for the reception, care, and training of homeless, needy, and afflicted children, and had rescued no fewer than sixty thousand destitute boys and girls. He was the champion of suffering children; he ventured into the most loathsome and dangerous quarters in pursuit of his prey; he feared nothing and nobody; he was pursued by malignant libels and not infrequently in danger of his life. But nothing stopped him.

His labours were incredible. He had hardly time for his meals, and was habitually dictating letters far into the night as a kind of finish to his day. There was a special night staff to work for him, for the day staff was exhausted when he was getting into his stride. Nor did he spare others. When his secretary applied for the job, the doctor, by way of testing him, dictated some correspondence at a furious rate. When he had finished, he said to the dazed amanuensis: 'How long will it take you to transcribe these notes?' 'Half an hour,' was the reply, to which the doctor responded with 'I want that letter to be ready for my signature in twenty minutes.' Certainly he was not an easy man to work with. He was so full of ideas and energy that he found it difficult to put up with the slower pace of ordinary mortals. Nor was he patient with mistakes, and when his dictation produced 'Sister Jones is looking very fat' instead of 'Sister Jones is looking very fit,' he was far from pleased.

The most interesting chapter in this fascinating book is that which tells the story of Dr. Barnardo's conflict with the Law. With unblushing effrontery he practised what he called 'philanthropic abduction.' He removed children from their unwilling 'guardians,' children who were often used for begging, stealing, and less reputable objects. His efforts in this direction remind one of an Edgar Wallace novel. He made no effort to conceal his crimes, and publicly asserted that he was willing to go to prison for his illegal activities. The verdicts in the Courts almost invariably went against him, but as he had securely hidden the children, in remote villages or even in Canada, nothing could be done about it. And in the end he had the immense satisfaction of securing a change in the iniquitous laws which protected the most cruel and immoral parents and guardians in the exercise of their 'rights.'

This admirable biography, by one who for years was in intimate contact with its subject, will help to preserve the memory of a heroic, loving, and devoted servant of a great cause. F. J. RAE.

Timothy Richard.

It is a hundred years since the birth of Timothy Richard. A fellow-missionary in China, the Rev. E. W. Burt, who, though working in a different part of China, often met Richard and whose affection and veneration for him grew with the passing years, has written a striking appreciation in the March-April issue of *World Dominion*.

One of Timothy Richard's claims to be a great missionary, he says, was that his methods were constructive, not destructive, and in every religion he saw germs of truth. He made a close and sympathetic study of all the Chinese religions. 'And he also cultivated the leaders of the numerous secret societies with which China is honeycombed and from whom have come some of our most stalwart Christians. Richard's chosen way was to make personal contacts with individuals rather than to address crowds in street chapels. He had an intuitive genius for making friends with all seekers after God.'

In the terrible famine of 1876–78 which carried off fifteen million people in China, Richard did splendid relief work and his name became a household word. He strove to rouse the rulers to undertake measures for improving communications and making better use of China's potential riches.

Richard was before his time, Mr. Burt says, but now time has caught him up and the principles which were depreciated in his life-time are adopted by his successors. 'For instance, as long ago as 1885 he advocated the opening of Christian Universities in every provincial capital. For twenty years he was a voice in the wilderness, but at last some twelve such Union Institutions have been established, and their students have done very much to make the New China.'

As Director of the Christian Literature Society he produced high-class literature to enlighten China's scholars. 'In this way he became a link between Old and New in China, and was a forerunner of recent reforms. The *International Review* and Mackenzie's *History of the Nineteenth Century*, and similar books, opened the eyes and dispelled the ignorance of many high officials, as they themselves acknowledged. And the pastors of the young Church owe much to his translations of Hastings' *Bible Dictionary* and the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, and many another volume, to add to their scanty library.'

Richard was a great peace-maker. Long before the founding of the League of Nations he urged some such federation of the nations and to this end he made long journeys and had interviews with leading statesmen in many countries.

'But greater than his achievements was his personality. . . . He kept the heart of a child to the end. Whatsoever was true and of good report appealed to him and was absorbed by him and revealed in his life.

The Centenary of Catherine Booth's Conversion.

Another centenary which should be celebrated this year is that of the conversion of Catherine Booth. Mr. Cyril H. Powell devotes an article to it in *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review* (January, 1945). He says, 'A doctor friend of mine, deeply interested in psycho-somatic relationships, has a stimulating point of view about Faith. Fear has definite bodily symptoms. One *knows* when one is afraid: an adrenalin reaction puts the body in a state of tension. Similarly one should *know* when one's state of mind is of the reverse order. "Faith" has bodily reactions: a sense of peace and well-being should be felt in moments of living faith. . . . The forgiveness of sins, when it is received in this fashion, becomes something definite, known—experienced. "The spirit witnesseth with our spirit that we are sons of God." . . . It is quite certain that something after this order happened in the life of an adolescent girl just one hundred years ago. For ever after she could appeal to that experience and could recommend it to others. She could now speak of God's Forgiveness and God's Love with the ring of certainty.'

'William Booth married a woman who was matched to him. She brought not only this spirit of enterprise, action, and daring faith to their union, but also a trained mind, a keen, logical intellect, and a background of culture that William Booth largely lacked.

'Their love-letters make interesting reading, "No, there is no fear of us loving each other *too much*," writes Catherine to her future husband in 1855. "How can we love each other more than Christ has loved us?—and this is the standard He has given. Indeed, this love will only make us more lovable in His sight! What a precious thing is this religion of Jesus! It makes our first duties our highest happiness! It has the promise of the life that now *is*, as well as that which is to come. We will spend all our energies in trying to persuade other men and women to receive and practise it."

'There is more than a hint in these letters, too, of a matter that was to prove very important: Catherine's conception of the status of women. She was convinced of their intellectual possibilities and was more than dissatisfied with the position accorded them in the Christian Church. She made it quite clear that she would never marry anyone who was not prepared to give woman her due. Little did she or her future husband realize how large a part they were destined to play in the story of the emancipation of women. The use that was made of feminine leadership in the Christian Mission and the Salvation Army had repercussions far outside the religious field, and without doubt affected popular feeling about woman's share in public life.'

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.